DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 041 202 AC 008 017

AUTHOR	Wilson, Duane A.; And Others
TITLE	Attitudes of County Leaders toward Expanding Adult Programs in Extension: Minnesota Expansion Study I.
INSTITUTION	Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. Agricultural Extension Service.
PUB DATE	70
NOTE	66p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.40
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Attitudes, Agriculture, *Community Leaders, Extension Agents, Federal Programs, Foreign Relations, Home Economics, Industrial Personnel, Labor Unions, Law Enforcement, *Program Improvement, Public Affairs Education, *Rural Extension, Soil Conservation, Specialists, *Statistical Data, Surveys
IDENTIFIERS	*Cooperative Extension Service, Minnesota

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted in Minnesota on attitudes of county leaders (commissioners, auditors, and appointed Extension committee members) on ways of expanding Extension programs. In each county data were gathered by questionnaire from at least two thirds of the leaders. Questions were asked about expansion (1) through working with other organizations, (2) through cooperation with federally sponsored programs, (3) through appointment of area agents, (4) through the exchange of work, (5) through new areas of specialization, and (6) through public affairs programs. Most responses to (1) were neutral, with the exception of a 46.4% favorable vote for working with industrial development groups. Response to (2) was varied, with a heavy majority of favorable responses to soil conservation programs and those in watershed development. There was little opposition to (3) and to the exchange of work (4) throughout the state, with less opposition to agricultural than to home programs. To (5) greatest support was given to help for law enforcement agencies and citizens with legal problems. Attitudes toward (6) varied greatly; most favored subjects were domestic agricultural policies and federal programs; opposition was shown to programs on foreign agricultural policies and international relations. (Appendixes provide tabulation of data by county.) (EB)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED041202

Special Report 31

MINNESOTA EXPANSION STUDY I

attitudes of county leaders toward expanding adult programs in extension

Duane A. Wilson, Howard J. Newell,
and Charles E. Ramsey

Agricultural Extension Service • University of Minnesota

AC008017

Duane A. Wilson is associate professor, district supervisor, county Extension work; Howard J. Newell is associate professor, district supervisor, county Extension work; and Charles E. Ramsey is professor, Department of Sociology and Extension sociologist.

ATTITUDES OF COUNTY LEADERS TOWARD EXPANDING ADULT PROGRAMS IN EXTENSION: MINNESOTA EXPANSION STUDY I

Duane A. Wilson, Howard J. Newell, and Charles E. Ramsey

This special report is a resume of a study conducted on attitudes toward expanding Extension programs for adults. The data on attitudes were obtained from questionnaires answered by members of the County Board of Commissioners and of the County Extension Committee in all Minnesota counties.

This report's main purpose is to help county Extension program planning by furnishing a summary of the attitude responses from each county. These responses represent the thinking of county leaders (commissioners, auditors, and appointed Extension committee members) at this time on several possible ways of expanding Extension programs. The study results may serve as a basis for discussion in each county.

INTERPRETING THE FINDINGS

What do the findings of this study mean? This question is of utmost importance, but it is not answered by a simple statement. Much of the answer lies in the consideration of what the findings do *not* mean.

THE STUDY IS A BASIS FOR DISCUSSION, NOT A FINAL VOTE

Many of the proposals discussed in this special report are very new and the respondents had little opportunity to discuss the proposals with other people before they returned the questionnaire. For this reason, even a strong opposition at this time may not necessarily mean the abandonment of a proposed program. However, if a particular program receives a high percentage of opposition in a county, that program should be discussed at length before being developed for that county. The reason for this deliberation is given in the next few paragraphs.

APPROVAL OF A PROGRAM IS A MATTER OF CONSENSUS, NOT MAJORITY VOTE

There are many ways organizations make decisions in planning and approving programs. Extension has traditionally worked on the theory of consensus based on the idea that practically everyone involved in the decision-making process should agree before a new program is adopted. Therefore, a relatively small opposition is socially significant, and may prevent the development of programs that are favored by the majority.

There are other processes of decision-making in program planning, each appropriate to certain sets of conditions. The interpretation of results would be different for these other processes. One other process is the democratic method, which consists of discussion and vote. The vote is based on the assumption that people have the responsibility to disagree, but to conform once a majority is reached. If such a theory were used in Extension, a program receiving a "yes" response of more than 50 percent would be an immediate candidate for adoption if further discussion did not reduce the favorable attitude.

Another process is often called the "conflict theory." In this process, the number of people involved in agreement is not as important as the relative strength of the faction--not strength in numbers but strength in power. The question would be *who* opposes, not how many.

Still another process involves the delegation of authority to a manager or to a professional expert. In this process, the person assigned authority is thought to have either a near monopoly on expert knowledge or on responsibility for successful programs. The interpretation of results of this study in an organization using the "managerial theory" would be used only in the case of extremely high opposition to the limitations which the membership has set upon the manager or expert. Those limitations would suggest the speed with which the manager can move and the degree of compliance he can expect.

However, the consensus theory used in Extension leads to a different consideration of the responses to the questions than would any of these other theories.

A SMALL AMOUNT OF EXPRESSED OPPOSITION IS SOCIALLY SIGNIFICANT IN THE CONSENSUS THEORY

How much opposition is needed to prevent the introduction of a new program? No categorical answer can be given to this question since the usual criteria of the majority vote or two-thirds majority are relevant only to another decision-making theory. Perhaps the best answer rests with consideration of the nature of opposition. Only three of these considerations are discussed here, thus omitting the important questions of who disagrees and how intense the disagreement.

1. *The opposition is usually higher than that expressed.* Previous research has indicated that respondents tend to say "yes" rather than "no." This tendency is probably greatest when the respondent is not sure of his response or perhaps really does not care. The tendency to agree

in this study is most likely to be a result of indecision rather than apathy. This conclusion is reached on the basis of two facts: (a) the willingness to spend the time involved in official connection with Extension, and (b) the high ratings of the importance of Extension in the quality of life given by the respondents in this study. (This was indicated in a separate question in the study not reported in this special report.)

The provision of a "neutral" category for responses probably minimized this tendency to answer "yes" in cases of indecision. Nevertheless, we must assume that the percentage of opposition is a somewhat conservative estimate of actual opposition.

2. If two people are opposed, they can reinforce each other. In any county, 20 percent opposition represents no fewer than two people. In the more than half of the counties in which all 12 county leaders responded, two people in opposition would represent less than 16.7 percent. The importance of two people, as opposed to one, in opposition is based on the operation of the consensus theory. When consensus is needed, there is pressure on the individual to conform. Therefore, the person who disagrees will often be reluctant to insist on or even express his opposition for fear of being viewed negatively by the other members of the group. However, when at least two people disagree, they can reinforce each other in discussion. The more vocal manifestation of opposition may convince those who are undecided. Therefore about 20 percent opposition is significant in predicting the reaction to proposals in a county.

3. Those who are opposed and remain silent often produce low participation on the part of clientele who think as they do. Silence results not only from the pressure to conform but from other factors, such as the personality of the individual, the informal leadership patterns that develop in the group, and the lack of familiarity with certain programs.

Why worry about the nonvocal opposition? One of the more important consequences of opposition is its effect on participation. Even well designed programs, appropriate to a problem in a county, sometimes are ignored or rejected by many people. One factor in this low participation is a result of programs not modified to meet the desires of the unexpressed opposition. Clientele who either follow the lead of nonvocal members of the committee or who think as these leaders do will, therefore, simply refrain from participating in a program which might have been modified had the opposition been expressed. The pressure to refrain from disagreement in the consensus organization may become a factor in producing low participation in some programs.

A NEUTRAL RESPONSE PLACES MORE RESPONSIBILITY ON THE PROFESSIONAL LEADER

There is a wide "zone of indifference" on the part of members of an organization between favorable and unfavorable attitudes toward a program. This zone of indifference is not apathy. Those who are neutral still are committed to the goals of Extension. Their neutrality toward a particular program reflects their feelings that the professional leader should decide whether or not this particular program is appropriate for this organization. In Extension, this principle means that the professional staff member must be sure that programs are developed to further the educational objectives of Extension.

The development of programs consistent with educational objectives is only part of the responsibility implied by a neutral response on the questionnaire. Members of an organization expect to be kept informed of the relationship between programs and goals by the professional leader.

Thus, a neutral response implies two responsibilities for county staff, district staff, and state staff: developing programs to further goals, and keeping the county leaders and clientele informed of the relationship between program and goals.

EXTENSION'S LINE RELATIONSHIPS PROVIDE LIMITED CONTACT AMONG THE VARIOUS PEOPLE RESPONSIBLE FOR PROGRAM PLANNING

Given the consensus approach to change, this limited contact greatly decreases the likelihood of consensus through discussion, and makes it very important to know the attitudes of county leaders.

The importance of the attitudes discussed here results from a relatively unique set of authority patterns in the development of Extension programs. Extension is controlled through several sets of line relationships. One line begins at the federal level, through the state office and district supervisors, to the county Extension staff. The flow of ideas for programs follows a second line which begins with the specialists, through program leaders to the county staff. Still a third begins with the county commissioners, through the Extension committee, to the county Extension staff. Thus we have people who must agree in each of these three sets of line relationships, yet with limited face-to-face communications.

The difficulty in gaining consensus from all of the lines of authority can be seen in a look at two flow charts. The first chart depicts the organization of the Minnesota Agricultural Extension Service, and the second shows the flow of ideas through the various groups of decision-makers in the development of new and expanded Extension programs.

MINNESOTA AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE ORGANIZATIONAL CHART



IDEA FLOW CHART



The Minnesota Agricultural Extension Service is organized and operates through the cooperative efforts of three levels of government: county, represented by the county board of commissioners, operating through the county extension committee and the county extension staff; the State of Minnesota, operating through the University of Minnesota and its various departments; and the federal government, operating through the Federal Extension Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. These government levels cooperate in the development of educational programs and make the resources of the University of Minnesota and the U.S. Department of Agriculture available to meet the educational needs of the people of Minnesota.

The primary function of the Minnesota Agricultural Extension Service is to provide opportunities for both adults and youth to extend and continue their education. One of the unique strengths of the service is its ability to involve people in the development of its educational programs and the ability to expand these programs or add new programs which will help solve the problems and meet the needs of local people. This points up the importance of integrating the organizational chart and the idea flow chart in the development of expansion of programs. The county Extension staff and the Extension specialists are members of the University faculty and hold federal appointments with the Federal Extension Service. Both the county staff and the specialists serve as educational advisers and consultants in a development of educational programs as they work with the various groups of county leaders and committees representing local people. The specialist staff provides the expertise of their respective disciplines and assists in coordinating the interdisciplinary nature of many of the educational programs in support of both county, area, and state programs.

The idea flow chart shows the county commissioners as representing the county; the research disciplines as representing the University; the state administrative staff and specialists as representing the Extension Service. It is assumed that this is a circle chart where lines would continue to go back and forth between local people and the County Board of Commissioners, the Extension Service, and the research disciplines. Ideas for educational programs may originate with any of the groups, but there must be consensus in the Extension view before the program can be developed and implemented. Consensus among the various groups of decision-makers is important in the acceptance of new or expanded educational programs.

The results of this study fill the gap left by the difficulty of indirect communication among the various lines of authority.

RESEARCH PROCEDURES

A need to know the types of expanded programs in Extension, desired by local leaders, prompted the study which included several types of expansion, some of which have received limited trial to date.

THE UNIVERSE OF STUDY

The need to determine attitudes of the leaders in individual counties was based on the notion, long held in Extension, that the county leaders must agree, or at least not disagree, about the Extension program. The need to plan at the county level made it necessary to send a questionnaire to the entire population of county leaders rather than to a sample. This decision made it impractical to interview personally the county leaders, because of the number involved.

The percentage response to this study is exceptionally high for a mailed questionnaire. The following table shows this response by type of respondent.

	Total Possible Responses	Total Actual Responses	Percent Responding
County commissioners	435	386	88.7
County auditors	87	81	93.1
Appointed members of Extension committee	523	501	95.8
Total	1,045	968	92.7

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The questionnaire was made up of several sections, most of which dealt directly with expanded programs. The first section was directed at expansion in youth programs, including sections on short term programs, methods, and new clientele. The succeeding sections were concerned with adult programs, including: (a) exchanging work between county staff members, (b) working with other organizations, (c) introducing a new emphasis in content beyond the traditional program, and (d) developing new specialist positions.

The questionnaire was precoded to speed the process of making results for their county available to county leaders at the earliest possible time.

THE ANALYSIS

This report is based on the responses of 92.7 percent of the county leaders in Minnesota who returned the questionnaire. The percentages give an equal weight to each leader's response. In no county are fewer than two-thirds of the county leaders represented in the statistics.

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

In the following pages the findings of the study for the state as a whole are presented. Corresponding results for each county are presented in tables in the appendix.

EXPANSION THROUGH WORKING WITH OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

One of the methods of expanding Extension programs is through increasing cooperation with other organizations in the county. Many agencies and local institutions have a need, to varying degrees, for the kinds of programs offered by Extension. The county Extension staff has already worked with some of these organizations in many counties. This question was framed to test attitudes toward more extensive work with these organizations (see table 1).

The amount of opposition to extensive Extension work with other organizations varies greatly. About 20 percent of the county leaders in the state oppose the expansion of work by the county staff with industrial development groups, but this is the lowest amount of opposition in the total range of organizations. The highest amount of opposition (from nearly three-fourths of the county leaders in Minnesota) is found toward expanded work with labor unions. Slightly over half of the county leaders oppose much time being spent with the League of Women Voters, and about 40 percent oppose much time being spent with nursing homes and retirement homes.

The pattern statewide is one of opposition to expansion through more Extension cooperation with other organizations in the county. However, there is variability among the counties; in some counties expansion by this means is viewed favorably by county leaders (see tables 1A, 1B, and 1C in the appendix for individual counties).

Among the county leaders not actively expressing opposition to expanded work with these organizations, a neutral response is far more frequent than a direct approval. The one exception to this pattern is the response to work with industrial development groups.

Whether the "yes" or the "no" column is considered, the industrial development groups are viewed more favorably than any other organization by the county leaders as target groups for educational programs in Extension. This result is somewhat surprising, since at an earlier time such cooperation would have been viewed with strong reservation by many county leaders. The change in attitude probably reflects the major role which industrial development groups play in present programs of community development. The change may be influenced, too, by the participation of many of our respondents in these groups. The increasing recognition of the need for local employment opportunities is also a major factor.

EXPANSION THROUGH COOPERATION WITH FEDERALLY SPONSORED PROGRAMS

Another way of expanding adult Extension work is through increased cooperation with federally sponsored programs now in existence. The Extension Service is itself, in part, sponsored with federal funds and the program is in part developed at the federal level. Therefore, some cooperation with other federally sponsored programs seems inherent in the organization of Extension work. Indeed, close cooperation has traditionally characterized Extension work in many counties.

Most of the traditional cooperation with federally sponsored organizations has occurred with programs located, administratively, in the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The question was directed at increasing cooperation with some of those programs in agriculture, but added many other programs. Again, the question was phrased to indicate more Extension work than the occasional provision of materials and services upon request.

The pattern of response to this question is quite varied, depending on the organization (see table 2). Two programs namely, the soil conservation programs and those in watershed development, receive extremely little opposition and a heavy majority of actively favorable responses. Both programs are closely associated with the traditional Agricultural Extension program. Both relate directly to agriculture, and by far the greatest number of responses are based on questionnaires from male county leaders who are or have been farmers.

Two other programs, farm operating loans (FHA) and federal farm programs (ASCS) receive approximately half of the responses as actively favorable, but there is sufficient opposition to expanded cooperation with these programs to warrant more discussion in the Extension committee.

Table 1. Expansion through working with other organizations, statewide percentages

Question: Which, if any, of the following organizations should Extension agents devote much time to in your county?

	Percent		
	Yes	Neutral	No
Industrial development groups	46.4	32.7	20.9
Nursing homes, retirement homes, etc.	14.3	41.8	43.9
Chamber of Commerce, Businessmen's Club, Community Club	33.1	42.0	24.9
Township Officer's Association	23.0	41.1	35.9
Business groups (resort owners, credit agencies, bankers, etc.)	19.3	43.0	37.7
Labor unions	3.4	25.2	71.4
Service clubs (Kiwanis, American Legion, etc.)	18.7	44.1	37.3
Business and professional women's groups	15.8	47.5	36.6
Women's study clubs	18.9	48.5	32.6
Sportmen's clubs	26.7	45.1	28.3
League of Women Voters	7.6	41.3	51.1

Table 2. Expansion through education work with other federally sponsored programs

Question: Which, if any, of the following federally sponsored programs should the county agents in your county do educational work with?

	Percent		
	Yes	Neutral	No
Farm operating loans (Farmers Home Administration)	46.0	33.6	20.4
Federal farm programs (ASCS programs)	52.0	29.2	18.7
Job corps	17.1	46.0	37.0
Loans for farm houses	23.1	46.3	30.5
Nonfarm low income housing programs	19.6	42.2	38.2
Milk marketing orders for producers	41.6	39.5	18.9
CAP (Community Action Program) councils	31.6	46.4	22.0
Operation head start	12.4	42.1	45.5
Pretraining program for adults (Manpower Development Training)	34.2	41.7	24.1
Soil conservation programs	76.6	16.6	6.8
Watershed development	68.4	24.0	7.6

The pattern among the counties is extremely varied. For example, even some of the more generally favored programs receive opposition from as many as three-fourths of the leaders in some counties (see tables 2A and 2B in the appendix).

One of the more surprising findings of the study is that there is more opposition expressed toward more extensive cooperation with Operation Headstart than any of the other federally sponsored programs listed. There are several possible explanations. The rural population in Minnesota generally has looked with disfavor on federal funds for federally designed school programs. There is doubtless some opposition to any program of the federal government in eliminating poverty. However, the greatest opposition to work with Operation Headstart compared to other poverty programs needs special attention, for Operation Headstart has the most favorable image of all poverty programs. Some of the opposition seemed to come from reports of the poor administration of the program in some communities, rather than from opposition to the principle itself. Further, Operation Headstart may be thought to have more professionally trained people already than Extension.

The pattern of response to the question of expanding Extension programs through greater cooperation with other federal-sponsored programs might be expressed as follows: with traditional programs, yes; with other programs in the agricultural context, probably, after discussion; with other programs, probably not.

EXPANSION THROUGH THE APPOINTMENT OF AREA AGENTS

Another way to expand the Extension program is through the use of area agents to assist the county Extension staff. Area agents have specialized training, which could be in soils, family housing, farm management, and they work with agents, local groups, and individuals in several counties.

There were several area agents already in Minnesota at the time the data were gathered. The question was asked to determine the method area agents would use.

There is little opposition to any of the methods asked about in the questionnaire (see table 3). In all but one type of work, more than half of the respondents favor the activity suggested.

It would appear that the development of programs utilizing the specialized area agent may proceed throughout most of the state. However, there is sufficient opposition to certain roles for the area agent in some counties to warrant careful selection. It would appear that area agents may find it conducive to their work if they play certain roles in some counties and other roles in other counties. The county results are presented in table 3A in the appendix.

EXPANSION THROUGH THE EXCHANGE OF WORK

Another means of expanding Extension programs is through the exchange of work among agents and counties. Agents have different background in training, different interests, and different talents. Sometimes an agent has prepared a particularly effective education program, and the clientele in nearby counties could profit greatly from the presentation of that program. In exchange for this work, the agents in those recipient counties offer a program in their own areas of interest.

There is small opposition to the exchange of work throughout the state, with less opposition found in exchanging work in the agricultural than in the home programs (see table 4).

Approximately two-thirds of the respondents approve of the exchange of work in agricultural programs, while slightly less than half approve of it in the home program. The predominance of males among our respondents accounted for large neutral response in exchange between home agents.

The county data are of particular importance in exchange of work, since the arrangements must be made between individual counties. The attitudes of county leaders limit not only the ability of their own agent in exchanging programs, but also reflect to some extent the receptivity of the program of agents from other counties. It is of paramount importance that the reception be carefully planned if agents are to be brought into a county with a high opposition to the exchange of work. Presumably, these agents from other counties would be invited by someone from within the recipient county who should be aware of the necessity of planning for receptivity. The data for counties are presented in table 4A in the appendix.

EXPANSION THROUGH NEW AREAS OF SPECIALIZATION

Extension specialists are the intermediary between the research scientist and the public. The specialist, usually based at the state college or university, is often a member of an academic department with a joint appointment in Extension. The specialist translates research findings and concepts into understandable applications, and in this sense is a necessary arm of the applied research organization.

Extension specialists have been increasing at a more rapid rate in Minnesota than most other Extension positions during the last few years. Nevertheless, there are many areas in which expansion in Extension might be made through the creation of new specialist positions. Proposals to expand specialist positions in parts of the University other than those colleges traditionally providing this type of service are of particular interest.

Table 3. Expansion through the appointment of area agents

Sometimes Extension has area agents to assist the county Extension staff. An area agent has specialized training (such as soils, youth, family housing, farm management) and works in several counties. The area agent works with agents, local groups, and individuals. In what ways, if any, can an area agent strengthen Extension programs in your county?

	Percent		
	Yes	Neutral	No
Working with special types of individuals (specialized farmers, home builders, fertilizer dealers, etc.)	44.7	40.1	15.2
Conducting leadership development programs for county leaders	57.4	36.4	6.3
Working on special projects (watersheds, health facilities, etc.)	52.0	37.7	10.3
Conducting applied research on local problems (drainage, soil fertility, consumer research, etc.)	60.9	30.5	8.6
Conducting educational programs open to the public	62.5	30.6	6.9

Table 4. Expansion through the exchange of work

Sometimes, an Extension agent who has prepared a special program may present it in two or more counties, in exchange for some kind of help from the agent in those counties. Do you feel that Extension agents in your county should spend much time in exchanges like this?

	Percent		
	Yes	Neutral	No
Agricultural programs	65.9	22.7	11.4
Home programs	46.9	38.3	14.8

The attitudes of county leaders in Minnesota do not indicate an overwhelming desire for these nontraditional areas of specialization nor is the opposition stronger than it was to other types of expansion reported previously in this special report. About one-third to one-half of the respondents are neutral toward the 10 new specialties included in the list (see table 5).

The greatest support is given to the specialized help that might assist law enforcement agencies, citizens with legal problems, and towns with problems of providing community facilities. The least support is given to helping groups interested in the arts and expand knowledge to schools.

The variability in the attitudes toward these specialties was very great among the counties. The information by county is presented in tables 5A and 5B in the appendix.

EXPANSION THROUGH PUBLIC AFFAIRS PROGRAMS

Another method of continuing expansion in Extension is through the public affairs programs, conferences, and workshops. This type of meeting, open to the public, is devoted to a broad issue and often includes several approaches to that issue. In the past the response to these programs has varied, depending on the issue, the planning that went into organization, and accidental factors such as conflicting meetings.

The attitudes of county leaders in Minnesota vary greatly, depending on the topic to be discussed. Clearly the most favored subjects are domestic agricultural policies and the availability of federal programs. All other topics received sufficient opposition to warrant careful planning and discussion before becoming the subject of a public affairs meeting.

The opposition to public affairs programs on issues in foreign agricultural policies and in international relations is surprising in the light of the heavy dependence of Minnesota agriculture on the development of foreign markets.

There was a great amount of county variation in the response to most of the topics. The county data are presented in tables 6A and 6B in the appendix.

Table 5. Expansion through increasing the areas of specialization

Extension specialists train agents, write bulletins, and conduct educational meetings in counties. Most specialists are from the Institute of Agriculture of the University. What kinds of additional assistance, if any, should be provided counties by specialists from other parts of the University?

	Percent		
	Yes	Neutral	No
Help to local business (personnel training, business management)	25.7	48.9	25.5
Help to local industries (new methods, new processes)	35.4	42.8	21.8
Help to schools (teaching methods, curriculum)	16.7	46.6	36.8
Help to county health organizations (developments in medical science)	24.8	49.3	25.8
Help to towns (problems of water supply and sewage disposal)	45.3	37.3	17.4
Help to home builders and buyers (new building materials design)	31.9	46.2	21.9
Help to groups interested in music, painting, drama	10.1	49.7	40.2
Help to groups interested in mental illness (causes and treatment)	33.7	45.5	20.9
Help to citizens on legal problems (inheritance, liability)	48.1	30.8	21.2
Help to law enforcement agencies (civil rights, delinquent prevention and treatment)	50.3	31.4	18.3

If you have checked "yes" to any of the above, should the county Extension agents be the ones to arrange this?

Yes	Neutral	No
63.6	27.3	9.1

Table 6. Expansion through public affairs meetings

Do you feel Extension agents in your county should sponsor educational programs on public affairs issues?

	Percent		
	Yes	Neutral	No
Domestic agricultural policies	63.8	23.1	13.1
Foreign agricultural policies	29.6	41.7	28.6
Problems of state and local government	39.2	33.7	27.1
Taxation policies	35.5	32.4	32.1
Mental health programs	20.1	39.3	40.6
Extent and causes of poverty	26.8	41.7	31.4
Availability of federal programs	55.1	30.7	14.2
Problems of international relations	11.0	44.5	44.5

APPENDIX

Table 1A. Expansion through working with other organizations (industrial development groups, chamber of commerce, Township Officer's Association, and service clubs like Kiwanis and American Legion)

Question: Which, if any, of the following organizations should Extension agents devote much time to in your county?

Percent answering-- for each response

Northwest District	Industrial groups			Chamber of commerce			Township officers			Service clubs		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BECKER	45.5	54.5	0.0	45.5	45.5	9.1	10.0	50.0	40.0	18.2	36.4	45.5
CLAY	27.3	45.5	27.3	36.4	36.4	27.3	9.1	27.3	63.6	18.2	54.5	27.3
KITTSON	66.7	33.3	0.0	11.1	33.3	55.6	22.2	44.4	33.3	0.0	33.3	66.7
MAHNOMEN	87.5	12.5	0.0	28.6	71.4	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7	0.0	28.6	71.4
MARSHALL	45.5	45.5	9.1	18.2	63.6	18.2	18.2	45.5	36.4	36.4	27.3	36.4
NORMAN	54.5	27.3	18.2	54.5	18.2	27.3	0.0	45.5	54.5	10.0	50.0	40.0
OTTER TAIL	54.5	27.3	18.2	27.3	36.4	36.4	20.0	40.0	40.0	25.0	33.3	41.7
PENNINGTON	58.3	41.7	0.0	41.7	33.3	25.0	27.3	18.2	54.5	30.0	30.0	40.0
POLK	63.6	18.2	18.2	20.0	50.0	30.0	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0	37.5	62.5
REDLAKE	70.0	0.0	30.0	55.6	33.3	11.1	11.1	55.6	33.3	11.1	77.8	11.1
ROSEAU	30.0	50.0	20.0	10.0	50.0	40.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	60.0	40.0
TODD	54.5	18.2	27.3	9.1	63.6	27.3	9.1	27.3	63.6	0.0	45.5	54.5
WADENA	66.7	11.1	22.2	22.2	66.7	11.1	11.1	55.6	33.3	11.1	55.6	33.3
WILKIN	63.6	18.2	18.2	58.3	25.0	16.7	9.1	36.4	54.5	40.0	0.0	60.0
TOTAL	55.5	29.5	15.1	31.9	43.7	24.3	13.0	39.9	47.1	15.2	40.6	44.2

Table 1A. Expansion through working with other organizations (industrial development groups, chamber of commerce, Township Officer's Association, and service clubs like Kiwanis and American Legion)

Question: Which, if any, of the following organizations should Extension agents devote much time to in your county?

Southwest District	Industrial groups			Chamber of commerce			Township officers			Service clubs		
	Percent answering-- for each response											
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BIG STONE	62.5	37.5	0.0	37.5	62.5	0.0	0.0	75.0	25.0	12.5	50.0	37.5
CHIPPEWA	36.4	36.4	27.3	9.1	72.7	18.2	25.0	41.7	33.3	9.1	63.6	27.3
COTTONWOOD	30.0	60.0	10.0	40.0	50.0	10.0	10.0	80.0	10.0	40.0	50.0	10.0
DOUGLAS	36.4	45.5	18.2	41.7	33.3	25.0	18.2	54.5	27.3	18.2	54.5	27.3
GRANT	54.5	36.4	9.1	54.5	36.4	9.1	45.5	27.3	27.3	9.1	81.8	9.1
JACKSON	33.3	33.3	33.3	33.3	33.3	33.3	50.0	16.7	33.3	9.1	36.4	54.5
LAC QUI PA	75.0	25.0	0.0	50.0	33.3	16.7	33.3	25.0	41.7	33.3	33.3	33.3
LINCOLN	45.5	27.3	27.3	9.1	63.6	27.3	9.1	27.3	63.6	9.1	63.6	27.3
LYON	44.4	33.3	22.2	50.0	20.0	30.0	11.1	55.6	33.3	30.0	30.0	40.0
MURRAY	54.5	27.3	18.2	36.4	45.5	18.2	9.1	36.4	54.5	9.1	54.5	36.4
NOBLES	50.0	30.0	20.0	40.0	30.0	30.0	30.0	40.0	30.0	20.0	60.0	20.0
PIPESTONE	60.0	40.0	0.0	30.0	50.0	20.0	20.0	60.0	20.0	20.0	40.0	40.0
POPE	45.5	54.5	0.0	36.4	45.5	18.2	36.4	45.5	18.2	18.2	36.4	45.5
REDWOOD	25.0	25.0	50.0	37.5	37.5	25.0	0.0	37.5	62.5	12.5	25.0	62.5
ROCK	36.4	45.5	18.2	36.4	27.3	36.4	0.0	81.8	18.2	33.3	41.7	25.0
STEVENS	36.4	36.4	27.3	27.3	36.4	36.4	9.1	54.5	36.4	36.4	36.4	27.3
SWIFT	50.0	30.0	20.0	50.0	30.0	20.0	14.3	42.9	42.9	12.5	75.0	12.5
TRAVERSE	54.5	36.4	9.1	18.2	63.6	18.2	12.5	62.5	25.0	11.1	55.6	33.3
YELLOW MED	33.3	44.4	22.2	33.3	55.6	11.1	33.3	44.4	22.2	25.0	62.5	12.5
TOTAL	45.7	37.1	17.3	35.2	43.2	21.6	20.3	46.9	32.8	19.7	49.7	30.6

Table 1A. Expansion through working with other organizations (industrial development groups, chamber of commerce, Township Officer's Association, and service clubs like Kiwanis and American Legion)

Question: Which, if any, of the following organizations should Extension agents devote much time to in your county?

Southeast District	Percent answering-- for each response											
	Industrial groups			Chamber of commerce			Township officers			Service clubs		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BLUE EARTH	20.0	20.0	60.0	20.0	50.0	30.0	40.0	30.0	30.0	20.0	40.0	40.0
BROWN	54.5	27.3	18.2	18.2	54.5	27.3	20.0	50.0	30.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
DODGE	41.7	33.3	25.0	41.7	33.3	25.0	58.3	16.7	25.0	16.7	33.3	50.0
FARIBAULT	25.0	41.7	33.3	33.3	16.7	50.0	16.7	16.7	66.7	27.3	9.1	63.6
FILLMORE	33.3	44.4	22.2	25.0	62.5	12.5	44.4	44.4	11.1	11.1	55.6	33.3
FREEBORN	25.0	50.0	25.0	42.9	28.6	28.6	28.6	42.9	28.6	28.6	28.6	42.9
GOODHUE	45.5	27.3	27.3	36.4	45.5	18.2	45.5	36.4	18.2	18.2	63.6	18.2
HOUSTON	33.3	58.3	8.3	41.7	41.7	16.7	54.5	18.2	27.3	0.0	36.4	63.6
LE SUEUR	27.3	27.3	45.5	27.3	9.1	63.6	0.0	10.0	90.0	9.1	36.4	54.5
MARTIN	28.6	14.3	57.1	28.6	28.6	42.9	33.3	50.0	16.7	25.0	37.5	37.5
MOWER	33.3	22.2	44.4	22.2	44.4	33.3	44.4	22.2	33.3	11.1	33.3	55.6
NICOLLET	16.7	50.0	33.3	50.0	33.3	16.7	28.6	57.1	14.3	16.7	66.7	16.7
OLMSTED	16.7	41.7	41.7	75.0	16.7	8.3	33.3	50.0	16.7	33.3	66.7	0.0
RICE	22.2	33.3	44.4	25.0	12.5	62.5	12.5	37.5	50.0	0.0	25.0	75.0
STEELE	54.5	9.1	36.4	50.0	41.7	8.3	45.5	36.4	18.2	33.3	41.7	25.0
WABASHA	54.5	27.3	18.2	50.0	20.0	30.0	40.0	30.0	30.0	30.0	50.0	20.0
WASECA	25.0	66.7	8.3	36.4	36.4	27.3	33.3	41.7	25.0	33.3	16.7	50.0
WATONWAN	75.0	16.7	8.3	8.3	83.3	8.3	25.0	66.7	8.3	0.0	83.3	16.7
WINONA	11.1	22.2	66.7	22.2	33.3	44.4	37.5	50.0	12.5	22.2	22.2	55.6
TOTAL	35.1	33.5	31.4	34.7	36.8	28.4	34.2	36.4	29.4	17.9	42.1	40.0

Table 1A. Expansion through working with other organizations (industrial development groups, chamber of commerce, Township Officer's Association, and service clubs like Kiwanis and American Legion)

Question: Which, if any, of the following organizations should Extension agents devote much time to in your county?

Percent answering-- for each response

Central District	Industrial groups			Chamber of commerce			Township officers			Service clubs		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
ANOKA	44.4	22.2	33.3	20.0	50.0	30.0	30.0	50.0	20.0	30.0	50.0	20.0
BENTON	27.3	63.6	9.1	54.5	45.5	0.0	10.0	50.0	40.0	20.0	70.0	10.0
CARVER	27.3	36.4	36.4	27.3	27.3	45.5	36.4	18.2	45.5	0.0	27.3	72.7
CHISAGO	27.3	63.6	9.1	27.3	36.4	36.4	9.1	45.5	45.5	9.1	54.5	36.4
DAKOTA	44.4	22.2	33.3	25.0	50.0	25.0	44.4	33.3	22.2	50.0	37.5	12.5
HENNEPIN	40.0	60.0	0.0	22.2	66.7	11.1	10.0	70.0	20.0	30.0	60.0	10.0
ISANTI	66.7	25.0	8.3	9.1	81.8	9.1	36.4	45.5	18.2	25.0	58.3	16.7
KANDIYOHI	45.5	27.3	27.3	36.4	27.3	36.4	25.0	33.3	41.7	36.4	27.3	36.4
MCLEOD	27.3	45.5	27.3	18.2	45.5	36.4	27.3	18.2	54.5	27.3	45.5	27.3
MEEKER	50.0	25.0	25.0	36.4	36.4	27.3	25.0	33.3	41.7	36.4	36.4	27.3
MILLE LACS	44.4	44.4	11.1	25.0	62.5	12.5	22.2	11.1	66.7	0.0	62.5	37.5
RAMSEY	33.3	50.0	16.7	66.7	16.7	16.7	16.7	33.3	50.0	33.3	33.3	33.3
RENVILLE	50.0	20.0	30.0	9.1	63.6	27.3	18.2	18.2	63.6	0.0	50.0	50.0
SCOTT	54.5	18.2	27.3	18.2	54.5	27.3	45.5	18.2	36.4	18.2	27.3	54.5
SHERBURNE	20.0	50.0	30.0	27.3	63.6	9.1	30.0	40.0	30.0	10.0	60.0	30.0
SIBLEY	33.3	44.4	22.2	36.4	36.4	27.3	10.0	50.0	40.0	18.2	45.5	36.4
STEARNS	30.0	50.0	20.0	36.4	36.4	27.3	20.0	50.0	30.0	20.0	50.0	30.0
WASHINGTON	18.2	54.5	27.3	27.3	45.5	27.3	30.0	20.0	50.0	20.0	30.0	50.0
WRIGHT	9.1	36.4	54.5	20.0	40.0	40.0	41.7	16.7	41.7	20.0	20.0	60.0
TOTAL	36.6	39.7	23.7	27.8	46.9	25.3	26.0	34.2	39.8	20.9	44.5	34.6

Table 1A. Expansion through working with other organizations (industrial development groups, chamber of commerce, Township Officer's Association, and service clubs like Kiwanis and American Legion)

Question: Which, if any, of the following organizations should Extension agents devote much time to in your county?

Percent answering-- for each response

Northeast District	Industrial groups Yes	Neutral	No	Chamber of commerce Yes	Neutral	No	Township officers Yes	Neutral	No	Service clubs Yes	Neutral	No
AITKIN	75.0	16.7	8.3	41.7	33.3	25.0	0.0	63.6	36.4	18.2	45.5	36.4
BELTRAMI	66.7	8.3	25.0	50.0	30.0	20.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	20.0	30.0	50.0
CARLTON	72.7	18.2	9.1	27.3	54.5	18.2	16.7	66.7	16.7	16.7	58.3	25.0
CASS	44.4	22.2	33.3	45.5	36.4	18.2	50.0	20.0	30.0	11.1	22.2	66.7
CLEARWATER	45.5	27.3	27.3	41.7	33.3	25.0	8.3	66.7	25.0	9.1	36.4	54.5
COOK	77.8	22.2	0.0	70.0	10.0	20.0	11.1	44.4	44.4	55.6	33.3	11.1
CROW WING	55.6	22.2	22.2	11.1	66.7	22.2	33.3	44.4	22.2	11.1	77.8	11.1
HUBBARD	88.9	0.0	11.1	22.2	55.6	22.2	22.2	77.8	0.0	11.1	66.7	22.2
ITASCA	60.0	30.0	10.0	22.2	44.4	33.3	11.1	55.6	33.3	0.0	44.4	55.6
KANABEC	63.6	27.3	9.1	30.0	30.0	40.0	11.1	44.4	44.4	0.0	22.2	77.8
KOOCHICHIN	50.0	30.0	20.0	30.0	50.0	20.0	12.5	37.5	50.0	0.0	66.7	33.3
LAKE	62.5	25.0	12.5	12.5	62.5	25.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	14.3	42.9	42.9
LAKE WOODS	54.5	45.5	0.0	18.2	63.6	18.2	22.2	66.7	11.1	22.2	55.6	22.2
MORRISON	75.0	8.3	16.7	33.3	25.0	41.7	8.3	50.0	41.7	41.7	25.0	33.3
PINE	66.7	25.0	8.3	54.5	18.2	27.3	36.4	9.1	54.5	0.0	36.4	63.6
ST. LOUIS	62.5	12.5	25.0	55.6	22.2	22.2	50.0	37.5	12.5	66.7	11.1	22.2
District TOTAL	64.0	21.3	14.6	36.0	39.0	25.0	17.9	49.4	32.7	18.7	41.9	39.4
State TOTAL	46.4	32.7	20.9	33.1	42.0	24.9	23.0	41.1	35.9	18.7	44.1	37.3

Table 1B. Expansion through working with other organizations (business groups like resort owners, credit agencies, bankers, women's study clubs, and the League of Woman Voters)

Question: Which, if any, of the following organizations should Extension agents devote much time to in your county?

Percent answering for each response

Northwest District	Business groups			Women's clubs			LWV		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BECKER	9.1	45.5	45.5	9.1	54.5	36.4	0.0	40.0	60.0
CLAY	9.1	36.4	54.5	0.0	45.5	54.5	0.0	27.3	72.7
KITTSON	0.0	33.3	66.7	0.0	33.3	66.7	0.0	11.1	88.9
MAHNOMEN	0.0	85.7	14.3	14.3	71.4	14.3	0.0	57.1	42.9
MARSHALL	9.1	45.5	45.5	18.2	63.6	18.2	0.0	45.5	54.5
NORMAN	9.1	54.5	36.4	18.2	54.5	27.3	0.0	72.7	27.3
OTTER TAIL	18.2	45.5	36.4	9.1	54.5	36.4	9.1	36.4	54.5
PENNINGTON	0.0	90.0	10.0	9.1	63.6	27.3	0.0	30.0	70.0
POLK	10.0	20.0	70.0	30.0	10.0	60.0	0.0	44.4	55.6
REDLAKE	22.2	66.7	11.1	22.2	66.7	11.1	0.0	77.8	22.2
ROSEAU	10.0	40.0	50.0	10.0	50.0	40.0	10.0	30.0	60.0
TODD	18.2	18.2	63.6	0.0	54.5	45.5	9.1	9.1	81.8
WADENA	22.2	44.4	33.3	11.1	55.6	33.3	0.0	44.4	55.6
WILKIN	45.5	27.3	27.3	27.3	45.5	27.3	9.1	27.3	63.6
TOTAL	13.5	45.4	41.1	12.7	51.4	35.9	2.9	38.8	58.3

Table 1B. Expansion through working with other organizations (business groups like resort owners, credit agencies, bankers, women's study clubs, and the League of Woman Voters)

Question: Which, if any, of the following organizations should Extension agents devote much time to in your county?

Percent answering for each response

Southwest District	Business groups			Women's clubs			LWV		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BIG STONE	12.5	75.0	12.5	33.3	44.4	22.2	12.5	50.0	37.5
CHIPPEWA	9.1	45.5	45.5	9.1	36.4	54.5	0.0	18.2	81.8
COTTONWOOD	40.0	50.0	10.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	10.0	80.0	10.0
DOUGLAS	18.2	45.5	36.4	9.1	45.5	45.5	0.0	36.4	63.6
GRANT	18.2	54.5	27.3	27.3	45.5	27.3	9.1	63.6	27.3
JACKSON	0.0	41.7	58.3	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	25.0	75.0
LAC QUI PA	33.3	33.3	33.3	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0	36.4	63.6
LINCOLN	27.3	36.4	36.4	27.3	45.5	27.3	0.0	36.4	63.6
LYON	20.0	50.0	30.0	20.0	30.0	50.0	11.1	44.4	44.4
MURRAY	27.3	54.5	18.2	36.4	54.5	9.1	9.1	36.4	54.5
NOBLES	20.0	70.0	10.0	10.0	70.0	20.0	0.0	60.0	40.0
PIPESTONE	10.0	50.0	40.0	30.0	40.0	30.0	10.0	30.0	60.0
POPE	18.2	45.5	36.4	0.0	72.7	27.3	0.0	45.5	54.5
REDWOOD	0.0	25.0	75.0	12.5	37.5	50.0	12.5	37.5	50.0
ROCK	33.3	41.7	25.0	25.0	41.7	33.3	16.7	50.0	33.3
STEVENS	18.2	27.3	54.5	0.0	45.5	54.5	0.0	27.3	72.7
SWIFT	12.5	62.5	25.0	0.0	57.1	42.9	0.0	71.4	28.6
TRAVERSE	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	62.5	37.5	0.0	37.5	62.5
YELLOW MED	37.5	25.0	37.5	50.0	50.0	0.0	12.5	50.0	37.5
TOTAL	19.2	47.2	33.7	19.9	47.6	32.5	5.3	43.2	51.6

Table 1B. Expansion through working with other organizations (business groups like resort owners, credit agencies, bankers, women's study clubs, and the League of Woman Voters)

Question: Which, if any, of the following organizations should Extension agents devote much time to in your county?

Percent answering for each response

Southeast District	Business groups			Women's clubs			LWV		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BLUE EARTH	30.0	40.0	30.0	20.0	50.0	30.0	20.0	20.0	60.0
BROWN	9.1	54.5	36.4	27.3	45.5	27.3	9.1	54.5	36.4
DODGE	16.7	33.3	50.0	16.7	41.7	41.7	0.0	33.3	66.7
FARIBAULT	8.3	16.7	75.0	8.3	33.3	58.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
FILLMORE	0.0	55.6	44.4	11.1	44.4	44.4	0.0	44.4	55.6
FREEBORN	14.3	42.9	42.9	28.6	42.9	28.6	14.3	42.9	42.9
GOODHUE	0.0	45.5	54.5	0.0	63.6	36.4	0.0	45.5	54.5
HOUSTON	9.1	45.5	45.5	0.0	63.6	36.4	0.0	45.5	54.5
LE SUEUR	9.1	36.4	54.5	18.2	54.5	27.3	0.0	36.4	63.6
MARTIN	37.5	25.0	37.5	28.6	28.6	42.9	0.0	42.9	57.1
MOWER	11.1	22.2	66.7	11.1	22.2	66.7	11.1	22.2	66.7
NICOLLET	16.7	66.7	16.7	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
OLMSTED	16.7	75.0	8.3	8.3	58.3	33.3	16.7	41.7	41.7
RICE	12.5	25.0	62.5	33.3	22.2	44.4	0.0	12.5	87.5
STEELE	0.0	63.6	36.4	18.2	45.5	36.4	9.1	36.4	54.5
WABASHA	30.0	50.0	20.0	10.0	60.0	30.0	0.0	40.0	60.0
WASECA	8.3	75.0	16.7	16.7	75.0	8.3	8.3	75.0	16.7
WATONWAN	18.2	63.6	18.2	33.3	58.3	8.3	0.0	66.7	33.3
WINONA	11.1	33.3	55.6	0.0	44.4	55.6	20.0	40.0	40.0
TOTAL	13.2	46.3	40.5	16.8	48.7	34.6	5.8	39.8	54.5

Table 1B. Expansion through working with other organizations (business groups like resort owners, credit agencies, bankers, women's study clubs, and the League of Woman Voters)

Question: Which, if any, of the following organizations should Extension agents devote much time to in your county?

Percent answering for each response

Central District	Business groups			Women's clubs			LWV		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
ANOKA	10.0	70.0	20.0	50.0	30.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	60.0
BENTON	20.0	50.0	30.0	0.0	80.0	20.0	10.0	40.0	50.0
CARVER	9.1	45.5	45.5	27.3	45.5	27.3	9.1	36.4	54.5
CHISAGO	0.0	54.5	45.5	0.0	63.6	36.4	0.0	36.4	63.6
DAKOTA	25.0	25.0	50.0	55.6	22.2	22.2	37.5	25.0	37.5
HENNEPIN	40.0	40.0	20.0	20.0	80.0	0.0	10.0	70.0	20.0
ISANTI	8.3	75.0	16.7	16.7	75.0	8.3	16.7	58.3	25.0
KANDIYOHI	18.2	54.5	27.3	18.2	36.4	45.5	0.0	54.5	45.5
MCLEOD	9.1	63.6	27.3	36.4	27.3	36.4	0.0	54.5	45.5
MEEKER	18.2	45.5	36.4	9.1	45.5	45.5	9.1	36.4	54.5
MILLE LACS	0.0	50.0	50.0	25.0	37.5	37.5	0.0	33.3	66.7
RAMSEY	0.0	66.7	33.3	16.7	66.7	16.7	0.0	83.3	16.7
RENVILLE	0.0	60.0	40.0	0.0	30.0	70.0	0.0	30.0	70.0
SCOTT	18.2	27.3	54.5	27.3	45.5	27.3	18.2	36.4	45.5
SHERBURNE	55.6	33.3	11.1	40.0	50.0	10.0	22.2	33.3	44.4
SIBLEY	0.0	72.7	27.3	0.0	45.5	54.5	0.0	36.4	63.6
STEARNS	30.0	30.0	40.0	10.0	70.0	20.0	20.0	40.0	40.0
WASHINGTON	18.2	45.5	36.4	9.1	54.5	36.4	27.3	36.4	36.4
WRIGHT	10.0	40.0	50.0	30.0	20.0	50.0	0.0	30.0	70.0
TOTAL	15.2	50.3	34.6	20.2	48.7	31.1	10.4	41.1	48.4

Table 1B. Expansion through working with other organizations (business groups like resort owners, credit agencies, bankers, women's study clubs, and the League of Woman Voters)

Question: Which, if any, of the following organizations should Extension agents devote much time to in your county?

Percent answering for each response

Northeast District	Business groups Yes	Neutral	No	Women's clubs Yes	Neutral	No	LWV Yes	Neutral	No
AITKIN	9.1	63.6	27.3	45.5	36.4	18.2	9.1	45.5	45.5
BELTRAMI	20.0	40.0	40.0	22.2	44.4	33.3	30.0	30.0	40.0
CARLTON	0.0	83.3	16.7	33.3	58.3	8.3	16.7	66.7	16.7
CASS	30.0	20.0	50.0	30.0	30.0	40.0	11.1	22.2	66.7
CLEARWATER	27.3	18.2	54.5	18.2	27.3	54.5	0.0	27.3	72.7
COOK	44.4	44.4	11.1	60.0	20.0	20.0	11.1	44.4	44.4
CROW WING	33.3	33.3	33.3	22.2	44.4	33.3	20.0	30.0	50.0
HUBBARD	22.2	55.6	22.2	11.1	55.6	33.3	11.1	55.6	33.3
ITASCA	11.1	44.4	44.4	11.1	66.7	22.2	0.0	66.7	33.3
KANABEC	11.1	55.6	33.3	22.2	55.6	22.2	11.1	33.3	55.6
KOOCHICHIN	22.2	33.3	44.4	11.1	33.3	55.6	11.1	44.4	44.4
LAKE	14.3	57.1	28.6	25.0	62.5	12.5	25.0	25.0	50.0
LAKE WOODS	0.0	90.0	10.0	9.1	90.9	0.0	9.1	81.8	9.1
MORRISON	8.3	50.0	41.7	8.3	50.0	41.7	0.0	50.0	50.0
PINE	16.7	41.7	41.7	18.2	27.3	54.5	9.1	27.3	63.6
ST. LOUIS	28.6	28.6	42.9	42.9	42.9	14.3	50.0	25.0	25.0
District TOTAL	17.9	48.1	34.0	24.2	46.5	29.3	13.3	43.0	43.7
State TOTAL	15.8	47.5	36.6	18.9	48.5	32.6	7.6	41.3	51.1

Table 1C. Expansion through working with other organizations (nursing homes, business and professional woman's groups, labor unions, and sportsmen's clubs)

Question: Which, if any, of the following organizations should the Extension agents devote much time to in your county?

Percent answering for each response

Northwest District	Nursing homes			B & PW groups			Labor unions			Sportsmen's clubs		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BECKER	40.0	40.0	20.0	30.0	30.0	40.0	0.0	40.0	60.0	27.3	45.5	27.3
CLAY	9.1	36.4	54.5	9.1	27.3	63.6	0.0	18.2	81.8	9.1	36.4	54.5
KITTSON	11.1	66.7	22.2	25.0	50.0	25.0	0.0	11.1	88.9	55.6	44.4	0.0
MAHNOMEN	14.3	28.6	57.1	0.0	42.9	57.1	0.0	14.3	85.7	14.3	57.1	28.6
MARSHALL	9.1	54.5	36.4	9.1	54.5	36.4	0.0	27.3	72.7	27.3	27.3	45.5
NORMAN	9.1	27.3	63.6	27.3	45.5	27.3	0.0	9.1	90.9	18.2	54.5	27.3
OTTER TAIL	36.4	45.5	18.2	9.1	54.5	36.4	18.2	9.1	72.7	36.4	36.4	27.3
PENNINGTON	10.0	40.0	50.0	8.3	58.3	33.3	8.3	33.3	58.3	30.0	20.0	50.0
POLK	10.0	20.0	70.0	22.2	22.2	55.6	0.0	11.1	88.9	22.2	33.3	44.4
REDLAKE	0.0	55.6	44.4	11.1	77.8	11.1	0.0	33.3	66.7	44.4	44.4	11.1
ROSEAU	0.0	50.0	50.0	30.0	30.0	40.0	0.0	40.0	60.0	10.0	60.0	30.0
TODD	9.1	45.5	45.5	27.3	9.1	63.6	0.0	9.1	90.9	9.1	45.5	45.5
WADENA	0.0	44.4	55.6	11.1	33.3	55.6	11.1	22.2	66.7	11.1	66.7	22.2
WILKIN	9.1	45.5	45.5	36.4	18.2	45.5	0.0	18.2	81.8	18.2	63.6	18.2
TOTAL	12.1	42.9	45.0	18.6	39.3	42.1	2.8	21.3	75.9	23.6	45.0	31.4

Table 1C. Expansion through working with other organizations (nursing homes, business and professional woman's groups, labor unions, and sportsmen's clubs)

Question: Which, if any, of the following organizations should the Extension agents devote much time to in your county?

Percent answering for each response

Southwest District	Nursing homes			B & PW groups			Labor unions			Sportsmen's clubs		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BIG STONE	37.5	37.5	25.0	12.5	75.0	12.5	0.0	37.5	62.5	37.5	37.5	25.0
CHIPPEWA	0.0	36.4	63.6	27.3	9.1	63.6	0.0	0.0	100.0	18.2	45.5	36.4
COTTONWOOD	30.0	50.0	20.0	40.0	50.0	10.0	20.0	50.0	30.0	40.0	50.0	10.0
DOUGLAS	18.2	36.4	45.5	25.0	50.0	25.0	0.0	27.3	72.7	25.0	58.3	16.7
GRANT	9.1	63.6	27.3	20.0	60.0	20.0	0.0	9.1	90.9	45.5	45.5	9.1
JACKSON	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	25.0	75.0	0.0	16.7	83.3	0.0	33.3	66.7
LAC QUI PA	16.7	50.0	33.3	18.2	36.4	45.5	0.0	16.7	83.3	41.7	33.3	25.0
LINCOLN	0.0	54.5	45.5	18.2	27.3	54.5	0.0	9.1	90.9	36.4	63.6	0.0
LYON	22.2	44.4	33.3	22.2	22.2	55.6	11.1	22.2	66.7	22.2	22.2	55.6
MURRAY	0.0	9.1	90.9	0.0	63.6	36.4	0.0	18.2	81.8	18.2	54.5	27.3
NOBLES	11.1	22.2	66.7	20.0	50.0	30.0	0.0	10.0	90.0	40.0	30.0	30.0
PIPESTONE	10.0	50.0	40.0	10.0	60.0	30.0	0.0	20.0	80.0	20.0	50.0	30.0
POPE	0.0	27.3	72.7	9.1	45.5	45.5	0.0	9.1	90.9	30.0	50.0	20.0
REDWCOD	12.5	25.0	62.5	12.5	37.5	50.0	0.0	12.5	87.5	25.0	37.5	37.5
ROCK	8.3	50.0	41.7	25.0	41.7	33.3	0.0	36.4	63.6	18.2	81.8	0.0
STEVENS	0.0	36.4	63.6	0.0	45.5	54.5	0.0	27.3	72.7	9.1	72.7	18.2
SWIFT	0.0	71.4	28.6	30.0	40.0	30.0	0.0	28.6	71.4	28.6	57.1	14.3
TRAVERSE	25.0	12.5	62.5	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	25.0	75.0	12.5	62.5	25.0
YELLOW MED	22.2	44.4	33.3	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0	55.6	44.4	37.5	50.0	12.5
TOTAL	11.0	40.8	48.2	16.9	43.6	39.5	1.6	22.1	76.3	26.3	49.5	24.2

Table 1C. Expansion through working with other organizations (nursing homes, business and professional woman's groups, labor unions, and sportsmen's clubs)

Question: Which, if any, of the following organizations should the Extension agents devote much time to in your county?

Percent answering for each response

Southeast District	Nursing homes			B & PW groups			Labor unions			Sportsmen's clubs		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BLUE EARTH	11.1	33.3	55.6	11.1	44.4	44.4	0.0	11.1	88.9	50.0	10.0	40.0
BROWN	36.4	36.4	27.3	0.0	63.6	36.4	0.0	54.5	45.5	18.2	54.5	27.3
DODGE	0.0	33.3	66.7	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0	16.7	83.3	0.0	41.7	58.3
FARIBAULT	8.3	16.7	75.0	8.3	41.7	50.0	0.0	8.3	91.7	16.7	25.0	58.3
FILLMORE	22.2	22.2	55.6	11.1	55.6	33.3	0.0	0.0	100.0	44.4	44.4	11.1
FREEBORN	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	71.4	28.6	0.0	42.9	57.1	0.0	57.1	42.9
GOODHUE	0.0	54.5	45.5	18.2	45.5	36.4	9.1	27.3	63.6	0.0	81.8	18.2
HOUSTON	0.0	63.6	36.4	18.2	72.7	9.1	0.0	18.2	81.8	9.1	63.6	27.3
LE SUEUR	9.1	36.4	54.5	18.2	36.4	45.5	0.0	9.1	90.9	18.2	18.2	63.6
MARTIN	0.0	28.6	71.4	0.0	57.1	42.9	0.0	16.7	83.3	14.3	42.9	42.9
MOWER	0.0	11.1	88.9	11.1	11.1	77.8	0.0	22.2	77.8	22.2	22.2	55.6
NICOLLET	0.0	50.0	50.0	16.7	50.0	33.3	0.0	50.0	50.0	20.0	60.0	20.0
OLMSTED	8.3	33.3	58.3	33.3	41.7	25.0	0.0	33.3	66.7	33.3	50.0	16.7
RICE	0.0	25.0	75.0	25.0	12.5	62.5	0.0	0.0	100.0	12.5	25.0	62.5
STEELE	27.3	45.5	27.3	41.7	16.7	41.7	27.3	27.3	45.5	33.3	33.3	33.3
WABASHA	20.0	60.0	20.0	20.0	50.0	30.0	22.2	33.3	44.4	40.0	30.0	30.0
WASECA	8.3	58.3	33.3	16.7	41.7	41.7	0.0	25.0	75.0	50.0	41.7	8.3
WATONWAN	16.7	50.0	33.3	16.7	66.7	16.7	0.0	41.7	58.3	16.7	75.0	8.3
WINONA	10.0	50.0	40.0	11.1	44.4	44.4	0.0	33.3	66.7	22.2	44.4	33.3
TOTAL	10.1	40.2	49.7	17.4	44.7	37.9	3.2	24.7	72.0	22.6	43.2	34.2

Table 1C. Expansion through working with other organizations (nursing homes, business and professional woman's groups, labor unions, and sportsmen's clubs)

Question: Which, if any, of the following organizations should the Extension agents devote much time to in your county?

Percent answering for each response

Central District	Nursing homes			B & PW groups			Labor unions			Sportsmen's clubs		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
ANOKA	30.0	50.0	20.0	10.0	60.0	30.0	10.0	30.0	60.0	40.0	50.0	10.0
BENTON	18.2	45.5	36.4	20.0	40.0	40.0	10.0	30.0	60.0	54.5	45.5	0.0
CARVER	9.1	27.3	63.6	9.1	18.2	72.7	0.0	9.1	90.9	9.1	36.4	54.5
CHISAGO	9.1	45.5	45.5	0.0	54.5	45.5	0.0	18.2	81.8	27.3	54.5	18.2
DAKOTA	25.0	12.5	62.5	25.0	37.5	37.5	0.0	37.5	62.5	50.0	25.0	25.0
HENNEPIN	40.0	50.0	10.0	20.0	60.0	20.0	30.0	50.0	20.0	10.0	80.0	10.0
ISANTI	0.0	75.0	25.0	8.3	58.3	33.3	0.0	33.3	66.7	50.0	50.0	0.0
KANDIYOHI	9.1	54.5	36.4	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0	27.3	72.7	25.0	33.3	41.7
MCLEOD	25.0	33.3	41.7	0.0	54.5	45.5	0.0	18.2	81.8	36.4	36.4	27.3
MEEKER	16.7	25.0	58.3	27.3	27.3	45.5	0.0	18.2	81.8	36.4	36.4	27.3
MILLE LACS	11.1	66.7	22.2	0.0	57.1	42.9	11.1	11.1	77.8	0.0	55.6	44.4
RAMSEY	16.7	50.0	33.3	0.0	66.7	33.3	16.7	50.0	33.3	16.7	50.0	33.3
RENVILLE	0.0	40.0	60.0	10.0	30.0	60.0	0.0	10.0	90.0	10.0	20.0	70.0
SCOTT	27.3	9.1	63.6	0.0	40.0	60.0	0.0	18.2	81.8	18.2	54.5	27.3
SHERBURNE	10.0	40.0	50.0	10.0	50.0	40.0	10.0	50.0	40.0	44.4	44.4	11.1
SIBLEY	8.3	50.0	41.7	36.4	18.2	45.5	9.1	27.3	63.6	27.3	36.4	36.4
STEARNS	20.0	40.0	40.0	30.0	40.0	30.0	0.0	40.0	60.0	30.0	60.0	10.0
WASHINGTON	20.0	10.0	70.0	18.2	36.4	45.5	0.0	10.0	90.0	27.3	45.5	27.3
WRIGHT	20.0	20.0	60.0	0.0	20.0	80.0	0.0	10.0	90.0	27.3	27.3	45.5
TOTAL	16.3	39.3	44.4	14.1	41.4	44.5	4.7	25.5	69.8	28.7	44.1	27.2

Table 1C. Expansion through working with other organizations (nursing homes, business and professional woman's groups, labor unions, and sportsmen's clubs)

Question: Which, if any, of the following organizations should the Extension agents devote much time to in your county?

Percent answering for each response

Northeast District	Nursing homes			B & PW groups			Labor unions			Sportsmen's clubs		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
AITKIN	18.2	45.5	36.4	18.2	45.5	36.4	0.0	18.2	81.8	50.0	33.3	16.7
BELTRAMI	30.0	20.0	50.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	80.0	20.0	50.0	30.0
CARLTON	36.4	63.6	0.0	25.0	66.7	8.3	16.7	58.3	25.0	25.0	58.3	16.7
CASS	11.1	33.3	55.6	50.0	30.0	20.0	0.0	11.1	88.9	33.3	22.2	44.4
CLEARWATER	18.2	36.4	45.5	9.1	36.4	54.5	0.0	36.4	63.6	9.1	36.4	54.5
COOK	22.2	66.7	11.1	80.0	10.0	10.0	11.1	0.0	88.9	33.3	55.6	11.1
CROW WING	10.0	70.0	20.0	44.4	33.3	22.2	22.2	44.4	33.3	55.6	33.3	11.1
HUBBARD	22.2	55.6	22.2	44.4	55.6	0.0	0.0	55.6	44.4	55.6	33.3	11.1
ITASCA	22.2	44.4	33.3	33.3	55.6	11.1	0.0	33.3	66.7	0.0	77.8	22.2
KANABEC	30.0	40.0	30.0	22.2	55.6	22.2	0.0	33.3	66.7	22.2	44.4	33.3
KOOCHICHIN	30.0	10.0	60.0	10.0	50.0	40.0	0.0	33.3	66.7	22.2	44.4	33.3
LAKE	25.0	75.0	0.0	25.0	62.5	12.5	0.0	37.5	62.5	50.0	25.0	25.0
LAKE WOODS	16.7	58.3	25.0	36.4	27.3	36.4	10.0	50.0	40.0	45.5	54.5	0.0
MORRISON	16.7	50.0	33.3	8.3	41.7	50.0	0.0	25.0	75.0	33.3	41.7	25.0
PINE	16.7	50.0	33.3	18.2	63.6	18.2	0.0	27.3	72.7	18.2	45.5	36.4
ST. LOUIS	42.9	28.6	28.6	44.4	55.6	0.0	14.3	42.9	42.9	44.4	33.3	22.2
Dist. TOTAL	22.5	46.9	30.6	31.1	45.3	23.6	4.5	32.9	62.6	32.1	43.4	24.5
State TOTAL	14.3	41.8	43.9	19.3	43.0	37.7	3.4	25.2	71.4	26.7	45.1	28.3

Table 2A. Expansion through education work with other federally sponsored programs (FHA, ASCS, loans for farm housing, Milk Marketing Orders for Producers, Soil Conservation, and Watershed Development)

Question: Which, if any, of the following federally sponsored programs should the county agents in your county do educational work with?

Percent answering for each response

Northwest District	FHA			ASCS			Loans for farm housing			Milk marketing			Soil conservation			Watershed		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BECKER	36.4	63.6	0.0	63.6	36.4	0.0	40.0	60.0	0.0	27.3	63.6	9.1	70.0	30.0	0.0	81.8	18.2	0.0
CLAY	58.3	16.7	25.0	58.3	16.7	25.0	16.7	33.3	50.0	16.7	33.3	50.0	50.0	41.7	8.3	66.7	25.0	8.3
KITTSON	80.0	10.0	10.0	80.0	20.0	0.0	30.0	30.0	40.0	40.0	10.0	50.0	60.0	20.0	20.0	30.0	50.0	20.0
MAHNOMEN	37.5	50.0	12.5	37.5	50.0	12.5	12.5	75.0	12.5	57.1	14.3	28.6	62.5	12.5	25.0	50.0	37.5	12.5
MARSHALL	60.0	20.0	20.0	40.0	20.0	40.0	30.0	50.0	20.0	10.0	80.0	10.0	81.8	18.2	0.0	72.7	18.2	9.1
NORMAN	50.0	40.0	10.0	70.0	20.0	10.0	44.4	55.6	0.0	40.0	50.0	10.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
OTTER TAIL	20.0	50.0	30.0	40.0	20.0	40.0	20.0	20.0	60.0	36.4	36.4	27.3	50.0	20.0	30.0	50.0	20.0	30.0
PENNINGTON	9.1	54.5	36.4	45.5	36.4	18.2	10.0	40.0	50.0	27.3	54.5	18.2	81.8	18.2	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0
POLK	44.4	22.2	33.3	70.0	20.0	10.0	11.1	44.4	44.4	22.2	22.2	55.6	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
REDLAKE	88.9	11.1	0.0	80.0	20.0	0.0	44.4	44.4	11.1	55.6	44.4	0.0	90.0	10.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
ROSEAU	33.3	22.2	44.4	33.3	33.3	33.3	11.1	55.6	33.3	44.4	33.3	22.2	55.6	22.2	22.2	60.0	30.0	10.0
TODD	45.5	27.3	27.3	63.6	27.3	9.1	18.2	54.5	27.3	58.3	41.7	0.0	83.3	8.3	8.3	66.7	25.0	8.3
WADENA	44.4	55.6	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	22.2	44.4	33.3	60.0	30.0	10.0	88.9	11.1	0.0	77.8	22.2	0.0
WILKIN	25.0	41.7	33.3	33.3	41.7	25.0	9.1	36.4	54.5	18.2	54.5	27.3	75.0	16.7	8.3	66.7	16.7	16.7
TOTAL	44.7	34.8	20.6	55.9	28.0	16.1	22.6	45.3	32.1	35.9	41.5	22.5	74.8	16.8	8.4	70.9	20.9	8.1

Table 2A. Expansion through education work with other federally sponsored programs (FHA, ASCS, loans for farm housing, Milk Marketing Orders for Producers, Soil Conservation, and Watershed Development)

Question: Which, if any, of the following federally sponsored programs should the county agents in your county do educational work with?

Percent answering for each response

Southwest District	FHA			ASCS			Loans for farm housing			Milk marketing			Soil conservation			Watershed		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BIG STONE	50.0	50.0	0.0	62.5	12.5	25.0	22.2	66.7	11.1	37.5	50.0	12.5	77.8	22.2	0.0	37.5	50.0	12.5
CHIPPEWA	58.3	25.0	16.7	54.5	27.3	18.2	18.2	45.5	36.4	27.3	36.4	36.4	100.0	0.0	0.0	81.8	9.1	9.1
COTTONWOOD	30.0	60.0	10.0	90.0	10.0	0.0	30.0	60.0	10.0	30.0	60.0	10.0	80.0	10.0	10.0	70.0	20.0	10.0
DOUGLAS	54.5	18.2	27.3	58.3	25.0	16.7	33.3	41.7	25.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	81.8	9.1	9.1	50.0	41.7	8.3
GRANT	45.5	54.5	0.0	72.7	18.2	9.1	36.4	54.5	9.1	72.7	18.2	9.1	81.8	18.2	0.0	63.6	36.4	0.0
JACKSON	33.3	41.7	25.0	41.7	41.7	16.7	8.3	41.7	50.0	16.7	58.3	25.0	66.7	16.7	16.7	75.0	16.7	8.3
LAC QUI PA	36.4	27.3	36.4	36.4	27.3	36.4	18.2	27.3	54.5	27.3	45.5	27.3	54.5	9.1	36.4	91.7	8.3	0.0
LINCOLN	36.4	45.5	18.2	9.1	63.6	27.3	0.0	36.4	63.6	18.2	54.5	27.3	72.7	18.2	9.1	81.8	18.2	0.0
LYON	33.3	55.6	11.1	55.6	33.3	11.1	25.0	50.0	25.0	55.6	0.0	44.4	90.0	10.0	0.0	80.0	20.0	0.0
MURRAY	54.5	27.3	18.2	54.5	18.2	27.3	18.2	18.2	63.6	18.2	54.5	27.3	81.8	18.2	0.0	90.9	9.1	0.0
NOBLES	60.0	30.0	10.0	50.0	30.0	20.0	20.0	60.0	20.0	66.7	22.2	11.1	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
PIPESTONE	50.0	20.0	30.0	40.0	20.0	40.0	20.0	50.0	30.0	60.0	10.0	30.0	70.0	20.0	10.0	70.0	30.0	0.0
POPE	36.4	27.3	36.4	36.4	18.2	45.5	45.5	27.3	27.3	50.0	40.0	10.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	81.8	18.2	0.0
REDWOOD	50.0	25.0	25.0	50.0	37.5	12.5	0.0	75.0	25.0	37.5	50.0	12.5	62.5	25.0	12.5	50.0	37.5	12.5
ROCK	41.7	41.7	16.7	25.0	50.0	25.0	25.0	33.3	41.7	27.3	45.5	27.3	75.0	25.0	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0
STEVENS	0.0	45.5	54.5	36.4	36.4	27.3	0.0	30.0	70.0	36.4	9.1	54.5	90.9	9.1	0.0	81.8	18.2	0.0
SWIFT	37.5	37.5	25.0	50.0	30.0	20.0	0.0	75.0	25.0	37.5	37.5	25.0	90.0	0.0	10.0	44.4	44.4	11.1
TRAVERSE	60.0	0.0	40.0	50.0	30.0	20.0	33.3	11.1	55.6	30.0	40.0	30.0	80.0	10.0	10.0	63.6	27.3	9.1
YELLOW MED	50.0	30.0	20.0	60.0	40.0	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3	10.0	70.0	20.0	90.9	9.1	0.0	72.7	27.3	0.0
TOTAL	42.9	34.7	22.4	48.5	30.3	21.2	20.7	43.0	36.3	36.1	39.3	24.6	81.5	12.0	6.5	72.1	23.9	4.0

Table 2A. Expansion through education work with other federally sponsored programs (FHA, ASCS, loans for farm housing, Milk Marketing Orders for Producers, Soil Conservation, and Watershed Development)

Question: Which, if any, of the following federally sponsored programs should the county agents in your county do educational work with?

Percent answering for each response

Southeast District	FHA			ASCS			Loans for farm housing			Milk marketing			Soil conservation			Watershed		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BLUE EARTH	40.0	10.0	50.0	44.4	22.2	33.3	0.0	55.6	44.4	25.0	62.5	12.5	80.0	20.0	0.0	90.0	10.0	0.0
BROWN	45.5	54.5	0.0	33.3	41.7	25.0	27.3	72.7	0.0	66.7	25.0	8.3	75.0	25.0	0.0	81.8	18.2	0.0
DODGE	25.0	41.7	33.3	16.7	41.7	41.7	8.3	50.0	41.7	50.0	41.7	8.3	41.7	25.0	33.3	41.7	25.0	33.3
FARIBAULT	25.0	41.7	33.3	16.7	25.0	58.3	25.0	16.7	58.3	25.0	58.3	16.7	66.7	25.0	8.3	91.7	0.0	8.3
FILLMORE	66.7	11.1	22.2	66.7	22.2	11.1	0.0	77.8	22.2	33.3	55.6	11.1	88.9	11.1	0.0	77.8	22.2	0.0
FREEBORN	50.0	25.0	25.0	50.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	37.5	37.5	37.5	37.5	25.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	62.5	37.5	0.0
GOODHUE	41.7	41.7	16.7	50.0	33.3	16.7	33.3	50.0	16.7	66.7	33.3	0.0	83.3	8.3	8.3	58.3	33.3	8.3
HOUSTON	50.0	25.0	25.0	54.5	27.3	18.2	41.7	41.7	16.7	72.7	27.3	0.0	63.6	18.2	18.2	54.5	27.3	18.2
LE SUEUR	41.7	25.0	33.3	25.0	25.0	50.0	8.3	33.3	58.3	8.3	50.0	41.7	58.3	25.0	16.7	50.0	33.3	16.7
MARTIN	75.0	25.0	0.0	88.9	0.0	11.1	0.0	57.1	42.9	42.9	57.1	0.0	77.8	22.2	0.0	77.8	22.2	0.0
MOWER	22.2	55.6	22.2	44.4	55.6	0.0	0.0	55.6	44.4	33.3	44.4	22.2	77.8	22.2	0.0	77.8	22.2	0.0
NICOLLET	80.0	20.0	0.0	83.3	16.7	0.0	60.0	40.0	0.0	80.0	20.0	0.0	85.7	14.3	0.0	85.7	14.3	0.0
OLMSTED	25.0	33.3	41.7	25.0	50.0	25.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	41.7	8.3	58.3	33.3	8.3	58.3	33.3	8.3
RICE	44.4	22.2	33.3	33.3	22.2	44.4	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	62.5	37.5	77.8	22.2	0.0	77.8	22.2	0.0
STEELE	27.3	54.5	18.2	63.6	36.4	0.0	27.3	45.5	27.3	27.3	54.5	18.2	72.7	27.3	0.0	72.7	27.3	0.0
WABASHA	72.7	27.3	0.0	70.0	30.0	0.0	45.5	27.3	27.3	70.0	20.0	10.0	90.9	0.0	9.1	100.0	0.0	0.0
WASECA	58.3	25.0	16.7	58.3	16.7	25.0	41.7	50.0	8.3	50.0	41.7	8.3	66.7	8.3	25.0	83.3	8.3	8.3
WATONWAN	50.0	41.7	8.3	41.7	41.7	16.7	8.3	66.7	25.0	27.3	63.6	9.1	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
WINONA	66.7	22.2	11.1	66.7	22.2	11.1	12.5	37.5	50.0	25.0	62.5	12.5	66.7	33.3	0.0	50.0	37.5	12.5
TOTAL	45.9	32.7	21.4	46.9	30.1	23.0	19.3	47.9	32.8	41.8	45.0	13.2	73.4	19.1	7.5	73.1	20.3	6.6

Table 2A. Expansion through education work with other federally sponsored programs (FHA, ASCS, loans for farm housing, Milk Marketing Orders for Producers, Soil Conservation, and Watershed Development)

Question: Which, if any, of the following federally sponsored programs should the county agents in your county do educational work with?

Percent answering for each response

Central District	FHA			ASCS			Loans for farm housing			Milk marketing			Soil conservation			Watershed		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
ANOKA	33.3	33.3	33.3	66.7	22.2	11.1	11.1	44.4	44.4	0.0	88.9	11.1	66.7	22.2	11.1	50.0	50.0	0.0
BENTON	36.4	63.6	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	27.3	63.6	9.1	50.0	41.7	8.3	83.3	16.7	0.0	50.0	33.3	16.7
CARVER	45.5	54.5	0.0	50.0	30.0	20.0	27.3	63.6	9.1	63.6	18.2	18.2	54.5	36.4	9.1	54.5	27.3	18.2
CHISAGO	60.0	30.0	10.0	30.0	60.0	10.0	30.0	60.0	10.0	70.0	30.0	0.0	60.0	40.0	0.0	63.6	36.4	0.0
DAKOTA	25.0	50.0	25.0	62.5	25.0	12.5	25.0	37.5	37.5	37.5	50.0	12.5	88.9	11.1	0.0	66.7	22.2	11.1
HENNEPIN	22.2	66.7	11.1	66.7	22.2	11.1	33.3	66.7	0.0	22.2	55.6	22.2	88.9	11.1	0.0	55.6	44.4	0.0
ISANTI	50.0	33.3	16.7	81.8	0.0	18.2	16.7	58.3	25.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	58.3	33.3	8.3	50.0	41.7	8.3
KANDIYOHI	66.7	16.7	16.7	41.7	33.3	25.0	27.3	54.5	18.2	60.0	20.0	20.0	80.0	20.0	0.0	77.8	11.1	11.1
MCLEOD	50.0	33.3	16.7	27.3	36.4	36.4	50.0	33.3	16.7	27.3	54.5	18.2	72.7	9.1	18.2	81.8	9.1	9.1
MEEKER	50.0	16.7	33.3	16.7	50.0	33.3	18.2	45.5	36.4	25.0	58.3	16.7	72.7	18.2	9.1	54.5	27.3	18.2
MILLE LACS	28.6	57.1	14.3	50.0	37.5	12.5	12.5	62.5	25.0	44.4	33.3	22.2	55.6	33.3	11.1	50.0	37.5	12.5
RAMSEY	0.0	28.6	71.4	14.3	28.6	57.1	0.0	28.6	71.4	0.0	28.6	71.4	42.9	42.9	14.3	42.9	42.9	14.3
RENVILLE	27.3	36.4	36.4	9.1	63.6	27.3	18.2	36.4	45.5	45.5	18.2	36.4	72.7	18.2	9.1	36.4	27.3	36.4
SCOTT	45.5	36.4	18.2	63.6	18.2	18.2	45.5	27.3	27.3	9.1	63.6	27.3	63.6	18.2	18.2	58.3	33.3	8.3
SHERBURNE	36.4	27.3	36.4	36.4	54.5	9.1	20.0	50.0	30.0	54.5	36.4	9.1	83.3	16.7	0.0	58.3	33.3	8.3
SIBLEY	54.5	36.4	9.1	54.5	27.3	18.2	18.2	45.5	36.4	45.5	45.5	9.1	83.3	16.7	0.0	63.6	27.3	9.1
STEARNS	50.0	40.0	10.0	30.0	60.0	10.0	20.0	50.0	30.0	50.0	40.0	10.0	81.8	18.2	0.0	70.0	30.0	0.0
WASHINGTON	45.5	18.2	36.4	72.7	18.2	9.1	25.0	16.7	58.3	54.5	27.3	18.2	91.7	8.3	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0
WRIGHT	54.5	9.1	36.4	45.5	9.1	45.5	10.0	40.0	50.0	50.0	20.0	30.0	72.7	9.1	18.2	60.0	10.0	30.0
TOTAL	43.3	36.6	20.1	45.6	34.4	20.0	33.7	46.4	29.9	42.6	39.5	17.9	73.0	20.5	6.5	59.2	29.6	11.2

Table 2A. Expansion through education work with other federally sponsored programs (FHA, ASCS, loans for farm housing, Milk Marketing Orders for Producers, Soil Conservation, and Watershed Development)

Question: Which, if any, of the following federally sponsored programs should the county agents in your county do educational work with?

Percent answering for each response

Northeast District	FHA			ASCS			Loans for farm housing			Milk marketing			Soil conservation			Watershed		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
AITKIN	45.5	36.4	18.2	58.3	25.0	16.7	18.2	63.6	18.2	58.3	25.0	16.7	75.0	25.0	0.0	63.6	36.4	0.0
BELTRAMI	54.5	36.4	9.1	58.3	41.7	0.0	27.3	54.5	18.2	66.7	25.0	8.3	75.0	25.0	0.0	58.3	33.3	8.3
CARLTON	66.7	25.0	8.3	83.3	16.7	0.0	41.7	58.3	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	91.7	0.0	8.3	66.7	25.0	8.3
CASS	30.0	30.0	40.0	45.5	27.3	27.3	10.0	50.0	40.0	27.3	36.4	36.4	81.8	18.2	0.0	72.7	27.3	0.0
CLEARWATER	36.4	36.4	27.3	36.4	54.5	9.1	18.2	54.5	27.3	45.5	36.4	18.2	58.3	25.0	16.7	50.0	33.3	16.7
COOK	55.6	11.1	33.3	77.8	0.0	22.2	55.6	22.2	22.2	22.2	33.3	44.4	75.0	12.5	12.5	55.6	0.0	44.4
CROW WING	87.5	0.0	12.5	87.5	0.0	12.5	12.5	62.5	25.0	62.5	25.0	12.5	88.9	11.1	0.0	75.0	12.5	12.5
HUBBARD	87.5	12.5	0.0	87.5	12.5	0.0	85.7	14.3	0.0	75.0	0.0	25.0	87.5	12.5	0.0	87.5	12.5	0.0
ITASCA	44.4	44.4	11.1	75.0	12.5	12.5	37.5	37.5	25.0	12.5	75.0	12.5	62.5	25.0	12.5	50.0	37.5	12.5
KANABEC	50.0	40.0	10.0	60.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	50.0	30.0	20.0	60.0	20.0	70.0	10.0	20.0	50.0	30.0	20.0
KOOCHICHIN	62.5	37.5	0.0	62.5	25.0	12.5	37.5	62.5	0.0	75.0	12.5	12.5	88.9	0.0	11.1	75.0	12.5	12.5
LAKE	25.0	75.0	0.0	87.5	12.5	0.0	25.0	62.5	12.5	12.5	37.5	50.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	37.5	62.5	0.0
LAKE WOODS	66.7	33.3	0.0	66.7	25.0	8.3	33.3	50.0	16.7	27.3	72.7	0.0	91.7	8.3	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0
MORRISON	25.0	41.7	33.3	41.7	33.3	25.0	8.3	41.7	50.0	75.0	16.7	8.3	83.3	8.3	8.3	66.7	25.0	8.3
PINE	83.3	8.3	8.3	83.3	8.3	8.3	18.2	63.6	18.2	72.7	9.1	18.2	91.7	8.3	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
ST. LOUIS	63.6	18.2	18.2	72.7	18.2	9.1	60.0	30.0	10.0	88.9	11.1	0.0	83.3	16.7	0.0	77.8	22.2	0.0
Dist. TOTAL	54.9	30.2	14.8	66.5	22.0	11.6	30.4	49.4	20.3	51.9	31.2	16.9	80.2	14.4	5.4	66.7	24.7	8.6
State TOTAL	46.0	33.6	20.4	52.0	29.2	18.7	23.1	46.3	30.5	41.6	39.5	18.9	76.6	16.6	6.8	68.4	24.0	7.6

Table 2B. Expansion through education work with other federally sponsored programs (Job Corps, nonfarm low income housing programs, CAP, Headstart, and Manpower Development Training)

Question: Which, if any, of the following federally sponsored programs should the county agents in your county do educational work with?

Percent answering for each response

Northwest District	Job Corps			Nonfarm housing			CAP			Headstart			MDT		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BECKER	0.0	36.4	63.6	45.5	27.3	27.3	50.0	40.0	10.0	20.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	50.0	30.0
CLAY	0.0	25.0	75.0	8.3	50.0	41.7	0.0	58.3	41.7	8.3	25.0	66.7	16.7	41.7	41.7
KITTSON	20.0	40.0	40.0	30.0	40.0	30.0	30.0	60.0	10.0	20.0	60.0	20.0	20.0	60.0	20.0
MAHNOMEN	25.0	12.5	62.5	12.5	62.5	25.0	12.5	37.5	50.0	12.5	37.5	50.0	37.5	37.5	25.0
MARSHALL	0.0	60.0	40.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	30.0	30.0	40.0	0.0	20.0	80.0	40.0	50.0	10.0
NORMAN	10.0	50.0	40.0	40.0	30.0	30.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	20.0	60.0	20.0	30.0	40.0	30.0
OTTER TAIL	20.0	30.0	50.0	30.0	20.0	50.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	20.0	30.0	50.0	40.0	40.0	20.0
PENNINGTON	10.0	20.0	70.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	16.7	58.3	25.0	0.0	30.0	70.0	25.0	33.3	41.7
POLK	0.0	22.2	77.8	0.0	44.4	55.6	0.0	44.4	55.6	0.0	55.6	44.4	60.0	30.0	10.0
REDLAKE	0.0	77.8	22.2	33.3	55.6	11.1	44.4	55.6	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3	55.6	33.3	11.1
ROSEAU	11.1	44.4	44.4	0.0	44.4	55.6	54.5	18.2	27.3	0.0	44.4	55.6	36.4	36.4	27.3
TODD	18.2	54.5	27.3	10.0	40.0	50.0	27.3	63.6	9.1	9.1	45.5	45.5	36.4	27.3	36.4
WADENA	11.1	88.9	0.0	22.2	44.4	33.3	33.3	66.7	0.0	11.1	55.6	33.3	55.6	33.3	11.1
WILKIN	33.3	16.7	50.0	41.7	25.0	33.3	25.0	41.7	33.3	0.0	41.7	58.3	25.0	50.0	25.0
TOTAL	11.4	40.7	47.9	20.1	41.0	38.8	29.4	47.6	23.1	8.6	43.2	48.2	34.7	40.3	25.0

Table 2B. Expansion through education work with other federally sponsored programs (Job Corps, nonfarm low income housing programs, CAP, Headstart, and Manpower Development Training)

Question: Which, if any, of the following federally sponsored programs should the county agents in your county do educational work with?

Percent answering for each response

Southwest District	Job Corps			Nonfarm housing			CAP			Headstart			MDT		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BIG STONE	37.5	62.5	0.0	37.5	50.0	12.5	57.1	42.9	0.0	25.0	50.0	25.0	37.5	62.5	0.0
CHIPPEWA	9.1	45.5	45.5	9.1	27.3	63.6	63.6	18.2	18.2	0.0	36.4	63.6	36.4	45.5	18.2
COTTONWOOD	20.0	70.0	10.0	20.0	70.0	10.0	60.0	40.0	0.0	30.0	50.0	20.0	60.0	40.0	0.0
DOUGLAS	9.1	45.5	45.5	9.1	54.5	36.4	45.5	18.2	36.4	0.0	54.5	45.5	25.0	50.0	25.0
GRANT	36.4	54.5	9.1	18.2	63.6	18.2	45.5	45.5	9.1	27.3	45.5	27.3	36.4	63.6	0.0
JACKSON	16.7	41.7	41.7	8.3	25.0	66.7	16.7	50.0	33.3	0.0	66.7	33.3	25.0	33.3	41.7
LAC QUI PA	18.2	45.5	36.4	36.4	36.4	27.3	45.5	54.5	0.0	25.0	41.7	33.3	36.4	54.5	9.1
LINCOLN	27.3	36.4	36.4	0.0	27.3	72.7	36.4	54.5	9.1	0.0	54.5	45.5	36.4	27.3	36.4
LYON	37.5	12.5	50.0	33.3	33.3	33.3	12.5	75.0	12.5	22.2	44.4	33.3	50.0	25.0	25.0
MURRAY	18.2	18.2	63.6	18.2	54.5	27.3	18.2	45.5	36.4	9.1	36.4	54.5	27.3	45.5	27.3
NOBLES	0.0	50.0	50.0	33.3	44.4	22.2	30.0	50.0	20.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	33.3	55.6	11.1
PIPESTONE	0.0	60.0	40.0	20.0	10.0	70.0	11.1	55.6	33.3	10.0	50.0	40.0	22.2	55.6	22.2
POPE	9.1	36.4	54.5	9.1	36.4	54.5	27.3	27.3	45.5	0.0	45.5	54.5	27.3	45.5	27.3
REDWOOD	37.5	62.5	0.0	0.0	57.1	42.9	25.0	37.5	37.5	12.5	37.5	50.0	50.0	7.5	12.5
ROCK	27.3	54.5	18.2	18.2	45.5	36.4	18.2	45.5	36.4	9.1	45.5	45.5	30.0	50.0	20.0
STEVENS	9.1	36.4	54.5	9.1	18.2	72.7	18.2	45.5	36.4	0.0	27.3	72.7	9.1	18.2	72.7
SWIFT	14.3	57.1	28.6	0.0	62.5	37.5	37.5	50.0	12.5	12.5	50.0	37.5	44.4	22.2	33.3
TRAVERSE	33.3	44.4	22.2	11.1	44.4	44.4	37.5	50.0	12.5	0.0	11.1	88.9	33.3	55.6	11.1
YELLOW MED	22.2	55.6	22.2	22.2	33.3	44.4	33.3	55.6	11.1	10.0	60.0	30.0	44.4	44.4	11.1
TOTAL	19.5	46.3	34.2	16.3	41.1	42.6	33.5	44.7	21.8	11.9	44.8	43.3	34.2	43.7	22.1

Table 2B. Expansion through education work with other federally sponsored programs (Job Corps, nonfarm low income housing programs, CAP, Headstart, and Manpower Development Training

Question: Which, if any, of the following federally sponsored programs should the county agents in your county do educational work with?

Percent answering for each response

Southeast District	Job Corps			Nonfarm housing			CAP			Headstart			MDT		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BLUE EARTH	0.0	44.4	55.6	0.0	44.4	55.6	11.1	44.4	44.4	0.0	22.2	77.8	50.0	30.0	20.0
BROWN	18.2	81.8	0.0	16.7	75.0	8.3	20.0	70.0	10.0	8.3	58.3	33.3	18.2	72.7	9.1
DODGE	41.7	25.0	33.3	0.0	45.5	54.5	33.3	33.3	33.3	25.0	25.0	50.0	25.0	41.7	33.3
FARIBAULT	16.7	33.3	50.0	8.3	50.0	41.7	8.3	41.7	50.0	0.0	9.1	90.9	33.3	41.7	25.0
FILLMORE	0.0	44.4	55.6	11.1	22.2	66.7	33.3	66.7	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7	11.1	55.6	33.3
FREEBORN	0.0	62.5	37.5	0.0	62.5	37.5	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	12.5	87.5	0.0	37.5	62.5
GOODHUE	8.3	58.3	33.3	0.0	75.0	25.0	25.0	58.3	16.7	25.0	25.0	50.0	16.7	50.0	33.3
HOUSTON	9.1	45.5	45.5	0.0	72.7	27.3	27.3	63.6	9.1	8.3	41.7	50.0	27.3	72.7	0.0
LE SUEUR	8.3	66.7	25.0	8.3	50.0	41.7	16.7	50.0	33.3	16.7	41.7	41.7	16.7	66.7	16.7
MARTIN	25.0	12.5	62.5	0.0	42.9	57.1	42.9	42.9	14.3	14.3	28.6	57.1	14.3	42.9	42.9
MOWER	33.3	11.1	55.6	22.2	33.3	44.4	11.1	66.7	22.2	11.1	44.4	44.4	22.2	33.3	44.4
NICOLLET	20.0	40.0	40.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	40.0	60.0	0.0	0.0	60.0	40.0	25.0	50.0	25.0
OLMSTED	25.0	58.3	16.7	8.3	41.7	50.0	66.7	25.0	8.3	18.2	45.5	36.4	36.4	54.5	9.1
RICE	12.5	25.0	62.5	0.0	25.0	75.0	0.0	62.5	37.5	12.5	12.5	75.0	11.1	55.6	33.3
STEELE	27.3	63.6	9.1	36.4	45.5	18.2	36.4	36.4	27.3	18.2	27.3	54.5	45.5	27.3	27.3
WABASHA	10.0	80.0	10.0	10.0	50.0	40.0	20.0	60.0	20.0	0.0	55.6	44.4	40.0	40.0	20.0
WASECA	9.1	45.5	45.5	58.3	25.0	16.7	16.7	41.7	41.7	8.3	33.3	58.3	18.2	36.4	45.5
WATONWAN	16.7	50.0	33.3	0.0	70.0	30.0	27.3	63.6	9.1	9.1	63.6	27.3	16.7	75.0	8.3
WINONA	0.0	12.5	87.5	11.1	33.3	55.6	0.0	87.5	12.5	0.0	62.5	37.5	37.5	12.5	50.0
TOTAL	15.3	46.8	37.9	12.2	48.7	39.2	23.4	52.7	23.9	10.1	36.7	53.2	24.9	48.1	27.0

Table 2B. Expansion through education work with other federally sponsored programs (Job Corps, nonfarm low income housing programs, CAP, Headstart, and Manpower Development Training)

Question: Which, if any, of the following federally sponsored programs should the county agents in your county do educational work with?

Percent answering for each response

Central District	Job Corps			Nonfarm housing			CAP			Headstart			MDT		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
ANOKA	44.4	55.6	0.0	44.4	44.4	11.1	55.6	44.4	0.0	55.6	33.3	11.1	44.4	33.3	22.2
BENTON	9.1	81.8	9.1	18.2	72.7	9.1	58.3	33.3	8.3	27.3	27.3	45.5	41.7	33.3	25.0
CARVER	10.0	40.0	50.0	0.0	45.5	54.5	27.3	45.5	27.3	9.1	27.3	63.6	10.0	40.0	50.0
CHISAGO	0.0	77.8	22.2	10.0	60.0	30.0	20.0	40.0	40.0	10.0	70.0	20.0	10.0	70.0	20.0
DAKOTA	50.0	37.5	12.5	37.5	12.5	50.0	25.0	62.5	12.5	37.5	37.5	25.0	37.5	37.5	25.0
HENNEPIN	22.2	44.4	33.3	30.0	40.0	30.0	30.0	50.0	20.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	66.7	33.3	0.0
ISANTI	33.3	66.7	0.0	27.3	45.5	27.3	41.7	50.0	8.3	8.3	58.3	33.3	50.0	41.7	8.3
KANDIYOHI	27.3	27.3	45.5	30.0	30.0	40.0	20.0	30.0	50.0	9.1	18.2	72.7	45.5	27.3	27.3
MCLEOD	9.1	54.5	36.4	18.2	54.5	27.3	27.3	45.5	27.3	0.0	70.0	30.0	36.4	54.5	9.1
MEEKER	30.0	60.0	10.0	20.0	40.0	40.0	36.4	45.5	18.2	0.0	27.3	72.7	45.5	27.3	27.3
MILLE LACS	55.6	22.2	22.2	33.3	33.3	33.3	62.5	37.5	0.0	0.0	62.5	37.5	25.0	37.5	37.5
RAMSEY	42.9	14.3	42.9	57.1	28.6	14.3	42.9	28.6	28.6	42.9	28.6	28.6	57.1	28.6	14.3
RENVILLE	0.0	18.2	81.8	0.0	45.5	54.5	27.3	18.2	54.5	0.0	18.2	81.8	36.4	36.4	27.3
SCOTT	9.1	54.5	36.4	27.3	36.4	36.4	36.4	45.5	18.2	9.1	36.4	54.5	36.4	27.3	36.4
SHERBURNE	20.0	30.0	50.0	18.2	36.4	45.5	36.4	45.5	18.2	20.0	40.0	40.0	18.2	54.5	27.3
SIBLEY	18.2	63.6	18.2	27.3	27.3	45.5	45.5	27.3	27.3	9.1	54.5	36.4	18.2	45.5	36.4
STEARNS	0.0	60.0	40.0	30.0	30.0	40.0	22.2	66.7	11.1	0.0	60.0	40.0	30.0	50.0	20.0
WASHINGTON	18.2	45.5	36.4	0.0	30.0	70.0	9.1	63.6	27.3	18.2	36.4	45.5	18.2	54.5	27.3
WRIGHT	18.2	45.5	36.4	20.0	0.0	80.0	20.0	30.0	50.0	0.0	45.5	54.5	25.0	41.7	33.3
TOTAL	20.9	48.2	30.9	22.5	38.2	39.3	33.7	42.5	23.8	14.5	41.5	44.0	33.8	41.0	25.1

Table 2B. Expansion through education work with other federally sponsored programs (Job Corps, nonfarm low income housing programs, CAP, Headstart, and Manpower Development Training)

Question: Which, if any, of the following federally sponsored programs should the county agents in your county do educational work with?

Percent answering for each response

Northeast District	Job Corps			Nonfarm housing			CAP			Headstart			MDT		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
AITKIN	45.5	36.4	18.2	18.2	54.5	27.3	50.0	16.7	33.3	18.2	45.5	36.4	54.5	45.5	0.0
BELTRAMI	0.0	18.2	81.8	30.0	40.0	30.0	10.0	80.0	10.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	30.0	40.0	30.0
CARLTON	0.0	91.7	8.3	41.7	58.3	0.0	33.3	50.0	16.7	8.3	66.7	25.0	41.7	41.7	16.7
CASS	0.0	30.0	70.0	0.0	20.0	80.0	36.4	36.4	27.3	10.0	20.0	70.0	36.4	36.4	27.3
CLEARWATER	0.0	36.4	63.6	18.2	54.5	27.3	0.0	70.0	30.0	0.0	63.6	36.4	27.3	45.5	27.3
COOK	11.1	22.2	66.7	22.2	55.6	22.2	80.0	10.0	10.0	50.0	20.0	30.0	55.6	22.2	22.2
CROW WING	33.3	44.4	22.2	22.2	66.7	11.1	0.0	71.4	28.6	0.0	50.0	50.0	55.6	33.3	11.1
HUBBARD	0.0	71.4	28.6	42.9	42.9	14.3	57.1	42.9	0.0	0.0	57.1	42.9	62.5	12.5	25.0
ITASCA	12.5	50.0	37.5	37.5	12.5	50.0	37.5	37.5	25.0	37.5	25.0	37.5	25.0	37.5	37.5
KANABEC	30.0	20.0	50.0	20.0	60.0	20.0	60.0	30.0	10.0	20.0	40.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	40.0
KOOCHICHIN	25.0	37.5	37.5	62.5	12.5	25.0	44.4	44.4	11.1	12.5	50.0	37.5	22.2	66.7	11.1
LAKE	12.5	62.5	25.0	37.5	37.5	25.0	12.5	87.5	0.0	0.0	75.0	25.0	37.5	50.0	12.5
LAKE WOODS	9.1	72.7	18.2	18.2	63.6	18.2	41.7	50.0	8.3	16.7	58.3	25.0	50.0	33.3	16.7
MORRISON	16.7	58.3	25.0	16.7	41.7	41.7	41.7	33.3	25.0	8.3	58.3	33.3	33.3	25.0	41.7
PINE	18.2	45.5	36.4	36.4	9.1	54.5	41.7	33.3	25.0	33.3	8.3	58.3	63.6	18.2	18.2
ST. LOUIS	55.6	44.4	0.0	50.0	25.0	25.0	55.6	44.4	0.0	50.0	37.5	12.5	88.9	11.1	0.0
Dist. TOTAL	16.6	46.5	36.9	28.4	41.9	29.7	38.4	44.7	17.0	16.6	45.2	38.2	45.0	33.7	21.2
State TOTAL	17.1	46.0	37.0	19.6	42.2	38.2	31.6	46.4	22.0	12.4	42.1	45.5	34.2	41.7	24.1

Table 3A. Expansion through the appointment of area agents

Question: In what ways, if any, can an area agent strengthen Extension programs in your county?

Percent answering for each response

Northwest District	Work with individuals			Leadership development			Special projects			Applied research			Public educational meetings		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BECKER	30.0	70.0	0.0	20.0	80.0	0.0	55.6	44.4	0.0	77.8	22.2	0.0	44.4	55.6	0.0
CLAY	63.6	18.2	18.2	45.5	45.5	9.1	63.6	18.2	18.2	63.6	27.3	9.1	27.3	54.5	18.2
KITTSON	40.0	60.0	0.0	45.5	54.5	0.0	33.3	44.4	22.2	55.6	44.4	0.0	60.0	40.0	0.0
MAHNOMEN	0.0	57.1	42.9	62.5	12.5	25.0	14.3	42.9	42.9	14.3	57.1	28.6	42.9	42.9	14.3
MARSHALL	33.3	22.2	44.4	55.6	44.4	0.0	50.0	40.0	10.0	63.6	18.2	18.2	80.0	20.0	0.0
NORMAN	45.5	36.4	18.2	45.5	45.5	9.1	72.7	27.3	0.0	72.7	27.3	0.0	63.6	27.3	9.1
OTTER TAIL	63.6	18.2	18.2	72.7	9.1	18.2	45.5	18.2	36.4	45.5	27.3	27.3	54.5	18.2	27.3
PENNINGTON	36.4	54.5	9.1	63.6	36.4	0.0	58.3	33.3	8.3	58.3	41.7	0.0	83.3	16.7	0.0
POLK	44.4	44.4	11.1	44.4	44.4	11.1	72.7	18.2	9.1	90.0	0.0	10.0	72.7	27.3	0.0
REDLAKE	55.6	22.2	22.2	55.6	44.4	0.0	77.8	22.2	0.0	80.0	20.0	0.0	80.0	20.0	0.0
ROSEAU	66.7	22.2	11.1	70.0	20.0	10.0	60.0	30.0	10.0	77.8	11.1	11.1	60.0	30.0	10.0
TODD	50.0	41.7	8.3	50.0	50.0	0.0	83.3	8.3	8.3	83.3	16.7	0.0	91.7	8.3	0.0
WADENA	22.2	55.6	22.2	60.0	20.0	20.0	44.4	44.4	11.1	55.6	33.3	11.1	54.5	27.3	18.2
WILKIN	41.7	41.7	16.7	75.0	16.7	8.3	75.0	8.3	16.7	75.0	8.3	16.7	58.3	33.3	8.3
TOTAL	43.6	40.0	16.4	54.9	37.5	7.6	59.4	27.3	13.3	66.4	24.5	9.1	63.3	29.3	7.5

Table 3A. Expansion through the appointment of area agents

Question: In what ways, if any, can an area agent strengthen Extension programs in your county?

Percent answering for each response

Southwest District	Work with individuals			Leadership development			Special projects			Applied research			Public educational meetings		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BIG STONE	75.0	25.0	0.0	77.8	22.2	0.0	62.5	37.5	0.0	62.5	37.5	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0
CHIPPEWA	58.3	25.0	16.7	75.0	25.0	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	91.7	8.3	0.0	58.3	41.7	0.0
COTTONWOOD	40.0	60.0	0.0	60.0	40.0	0.0	70.0	20.0	10.0	40.0	50.0	10.0	77.8	0.0	22.2
DOUGLAS	36.4	54.5	9.1	44.4	44.4	11.1	63.6	36.4	0.0	70.0	30.0	0.0	60.0	40.0	0.0
GRANT	45.5	36.4	18.2	45.5	45.5	9.1	45.5	54.5	0.0	45.5	54.5	0.0	81.8	18.2	0.0
JACKSON	30.0	40.0	30.0	50.0	40.0	10.0	45.5	36.4	18.2	45.5	36.4	18.2	54.5	36.4	9.1
LAC QUI PA	9.1	72.7	18.2	45.5	45.5	9.1	54.5	36.4	9.1	63.6	36.4	0.0	50.0	33.3	16.7
LINCOLN	36.4	45.5	18.2	27.3	63.6	9.1	72.7	18.2	9.1	63.6	27.3	9.1	63.6	36.4	0.0
LYON	60.0	20.0	20.0	60.0	30.0	10.0	70.0	30.0	0.0	70.0	20.0	10.0	40.0	60.0	0.0
MURRAY	40.0	40.0	20.0	40.0	60.0	0.0	60.0	40.0	0.0	60.0	30.0	10.0	50.0	30.0	20.0
NOBLES	70.0	10.0	20.0	70.0	20.0	10.0	80.0	20.0	0.0	90.0	10.0	0.0	80.0	20.0	0.0
PIPESTONE	50.0	40.0	10.0	70.0	30.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	70.0	30.0	0.0	80.0	10.0	10.0
POPE	72.7	18.2	9.1	54.5	27.3	18.2	36.4	54.5	9.1	81.8	0.0	18.2	63.6	18.2	18.2
REDWOOD	50.0	37.5	12.5	62.5	25.0	12.5	75.0	12.5	12.5	100.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	25.0	25.0
ROCK	27.3	63.6	9.1	54.5	18.2	27.3	45.5	27.3	27.3	54.5	27.3	18.2	66.7	25.0	8.3
STEVENS	36.4	36.4	27.3	63.6	27.3	9.1	54.5	36.4	9.1	54.5	36.4	9.1	50.0	30.0	20.0
SWIFT	20.0	60.0	20.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	36.4	63.6	0.0	45.5	54.5	0.0	63.6	36.4	0.0
TRAVERSE	40.0	30.0	30.0	27.3	63.6	9.1	30.0	60.0	10.0	50.0	40.0	10.0	54.5	45.5	0.0
YELLOW MED	30.0	50.0	20.0	60.0	40.0	0.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	54.5	27.3	18.2	50.0	50.0	0.0
TOTAL	43.1	40.5	16.4	54.4	37.9	7.7	55.3	37.6	7.1	63.5	29.4	7.1	61.1	31.3	7.6

Table 3A. Expansion through the appointment of area agents

Question: In what ways, if any, can an area agent strengthen Extension programs in your county?

Percent answering for each response

Southeast District	Work with individuals			Leadership development			Special projects			Applied research			Public educational meetings		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BLUE EARTH	44.4	33.3	22.2	66.7	22.2	11.1	66.7	33.3	0.0	55.6	44.4	0.0	44.4	33.3	22.2
BROWN	41.7	50.0	8.3	50.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	66.7	25.0	8.3
DODGE	50.0	33.3	16.7	91.7	8.3	0.0	50.0	25.0	25.0	58.3	16.7	25.0	83.3	16.7	0.0
FARIBAULT	33.3	33.3	33.3	58.3	41.7	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	41.7	33.3	25.0	50.0	25.0	25.0
FILLMORE	55.6	33.3	11.1	77.8	22.2	0.0	77.8	22.2	0.0	77.8	11.1	11.1	77.8	11.1	11.1
FREEBORN	50.0	37.5	12.5	37.5	62.5	0.0	62.5	25.0	12.5	75.0	25.0	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0
GOODHUE	18.2	36.4	45.5	18.2	45.5	36.4	18.2	45.5	36.4	18.2	45.5	36.4	27.3	45.5	27.3
HOUSTON	25.0	41.7	33.3	54.5	45.5	0.0	54.5	45.5	0.0	45.5	18.2	36.4	63.6	27.3	9.1
LE SUEUR	50.0	33.3	16.7	66.7	25.0	8.3	33.3	50.0	16.7	75.0	16.7	8.3	58.3	33.3	8.3
MARTIN	50.0	50.0	0.0	55.6	33.3	11.1	75.0	25.0	0.0	57.1	42.9	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
MOWER	37.5	25.0	37.5	50.0	37.5	12.5	62.5	12.5	25.0	55.6	22.2	22.2	22.2	55.6	22.2
NICOLLET	14.3	71.4	14.3	50.0	50.0	0.0	40.0	60.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	83.3	16.7	0.0
OLMSTED	58.3	41.7	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	58.3	41.7	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0
RICE	37.5	37.5	25.0	62.5	25.0	12.5	0.0	62.5	37.5	37.5	37.5	25.0	55.6	22.2	22.2
STEELE	58.3	0.0	41.7	50.0	33.3	16.7	50.0	16.7	33.3	75.0	8.3	16.7	66.7	33.3	0.0
WABASHA	45.5	9.1	45.5	75.0	16.7	8.3	66.7	25.0	8.3	81.8	9.1	9.1	75.0	25.0	0.0
WASECA	36.4	45.5	18.2	50.0	41.7	8.3	16.7	58.3	25.0	33.3	50.0	16.7	58.3	41.7	0.0
WATONWAN	41.7	58.3	0.0	45.5	54.5	0.0	83.3	8.3	8.3	58.3	41.7	0.0	41.7	50.0	8.3
WINONA	44.4	44.4	11.1	55.6	33.3	11.1	22.2	66.7	11.1	44.4	44.4	11.1	33.3	55.6	11.1
TOTAL	42.1	36.9	21.0	56.4	36.4	7.2	51.0	36.1	12.9	58.2	28.4	13.4	58.4	32.5	9.1

Table 3A. Expansion through the appointment of area agents

Question: In what ways, if any, can an area agent strengthen Extension programs in your county?

Percent answering for each response

Central District	Work with individuals			Leadership development			Special projects			Applied research			Public educational meetings		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
ANOKA	55.6	33.3	11.1	60.0	40.0	0.0	90.0	10.0	0.0	80.0	10.0	10.0	60.0	30.0	10.0
BENTON	18.2	63.6	18.2	58.3	41.7	0.0	50.0	41.7	8.3	63.6	36.4	0.0	83.3	16.7	0.0
CARVER	45.5	45.5	9.1	54.5	45.5	0.0	45.5	45.5	9.1	54.5	27.3	18.2	63.6	36.4	0.0
CHISAGO	27.3	54.5	18.2	63.6	18.2	18.2	45.5	54.5	0.0	63.6	36.4	0.0	36.4	54.5	9.1
DAKOTA	44.4	44.4	11.1	77.8	11.1	11.1	44.4	44.4	11.1	44.4	55.6	0.0	55.6	44.4	0.0
HENNEPIN	62.5	37.5	0.0	77.8	22.2	0.0	62.5	37.5	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0
ISANTI	50.0	33.3	16.7	58.3	41.7	0.0	50.0	41.7	8.3	41.7	50.0	8.3	58.3	41.7	0.0
KANDIYOHI	41.7	41.7	16.7	58.3	41.7	0.0	41.7	33.3	25.0	81.8	18.2	0.0	33.3	50.0	16.7
MCLEOD	41.7	50.0	8.3	66.7	8.3	25.0	27.3	63.6	9.1	63.6	27.3	9.1	90.9	0.0	9.1
MEEKER	41.7	50.0	8.3	54.5	45.5	0.0	18.2	63.6	18.2	41.7	50.0	8.3	45.5	45.5	9.1
MILLE LACS	50.0	50.0	0.0	62.5	37.5	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	12.5	75.0	12.5	37.5	62.5	0.0
RAMSEY	14.3	71.4	14.3	42.9	57.1	0.0	28.6	57.1	14.3	42.9	42.9	14.3	71.4	28.6	0.0
RENVILLE	27.3	45.5	27.3	40.0	40.0	20.0	20.0	50.0	30.0	63.6	27.3	9.1	63.6	18.2	18.2
SCOTT	50.0	30.0	20.0	50.0	30.0	20.0	50.0	40.0	10.0	60.0	20.0	20.0	63.6	27.3	9.1
SHERBURNE	20.0	80.0	0.0	80.0	20.0	0.0	60.0	30.0	10.0	54.5	45.5	0.0	72.7	27.3	0.0
SIBLEY	63.6	27.3	9.1	72.7	27.3	0.0	66.7	25.0	8.3	63.6	27.3	9.1	75.0	25.0	0.0
STEARNS	40.0	60.0	0.0	40.0	60.0	0.0	63.6	36.4	0.0	40.0	60.0	0.0	60.0	40.0	0.0
WASHINGTON	63.6	36.4	0.0	45.5	54.5	0.0	33.3	58.3	8.3	66.7	25.0	8.3	50.0	50.0	0.0
WRIGHT	60.0	20.0	20.0	36.4	54.5	9.1	44.4	33.3	22.2	60.0	30.0	10.0	45.5	27.3	27.3
TOTAL	43.1	45.6	11.3	57.9	36.5	5.6	46.9	42.9	10.2	57.1	35.7	7.1	59.7	34.3	6.0

Table 3A. Expansion through the appointment of area agents

Question: In what ways, if any, can an area agent strengthen Extension programs in your county?

Percent answering for each response

Northeast District	Work with individuals			Leadership development			Special projects			Applied research			Public educational meetings		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
AITKIN	54.5	45.5	0.0	54.5	36.4	9.1	63.6	36.4	0.0	36.4	54.5	9.1	81.8	9.1	9.1
BELTRAMI	63.6	27.3	9.1	60.0	30.0	10.0	20.0	50.0	30.0	54.5	18.2	27.3	75.0	8.3	16.7
CARLTON	75.0	25.0	0.0	83.3	16.7	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	83.3	16.7	0.0
CASS	36.4	54.5	9.1	63.6	36.4	0.0	10.0	70.0	20.0	45.5	54.5	0.0	54.5	45.5	0.0
CLEARWATER	36.4	36.4	27.3	40.0	40.0	20.0	20.0	60.0	20.0	70.0	20.0	10.0	72.7	27.3	0.0
COOK	55.6	22.2	22.2	80.0	20.0	0.0	66.7	22.2	11.1	66.7	33.3	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
CROW WING	50.0	50.0	0.0	25.0	75.0	0.0	12.5	75.0	12.5	50.0	50.0	0.0	44.4	55.6	0.0
HUBBARD	66.7	33.3	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	66.7	22.2	11.1	55.6	44.4	0.0	55.6	44.4	0.0
ITASCA	44.4	33.3	22.2	60.0	40.0	0.0	66.7	22.2	11.1	66.7	22.2	11.1	77.8	22.2	0.0
KANABEC	50.0	30.0	20.0	70.0	20.0	10.0	72.7	9.1	18.2	70.0	20.0	10.0	60.0	30.0	10.0
KOOCHICHIN	40.0	60.0	0.0	55.6	44.4	0.0	44.4	44.4	11.1	60.0	30.0	10.0	60.0	30.0	10.0
LAKE	37.5	50.0	12.5	50.0	50.0	0.0	25.0	75.0	0.0	75.0	12.5	12.5	75.0	25.0	0.0
LAKE WOODS	50.0	33.3	16.7	63.6	36.4	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	66.7	25.0	8.3	63.6	27.3	9.1
MORRISON	41.7	50.0	8.3	58.3	41.7	0.0	41.7	58.3	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0
PINE	63.6	27.3	9.1	75.0	25.0	0.0	63.6	36.4	0.0	58.3	41.7	0.0	75.0	16.7	8.3
ST. LOUIS	72.7	18.2	9.1	91.7	8.3	0.0	60.0	40.0	0.0	81.8	18.2	0.0	90.9	9.1	0.0
District TOTAL	52.7	37.0	10.3	63.6	33.3	3.0	48.4	42.9	8.7	60.6	33.3	6.1	71.7	24.1	4.2
State TOTAL	44.7	40.1	15.2	57.4	36.4	6.3	52.0	37.7	10.3	60.9	30.5	8.6	62.5	30.6	6.9

Table 4A. Expansion through the exchange of work

Question: Do you feel that Extension agents in your county should spend much time in exchanges with other counties?

Northwest District	Agricultural program Yes	Neutral	No	Home program Yes	Neutral	No
	Percent answering for each response					
BECKER	30.0	60.0	10.0	22.2	55.6	22.2
CLAY	66.7	16.7	16.7	58.3	25.0	16.7
KITTSON	50.0	16.7	33.3	27.3	45.5	27.3
MAHNOMEN	71.4	28.6	0.0	57.1	42.9	0.0
MARSHALL	63.6	27.3	9.1	54.5	36.4	9.1
NORMAN	45.5	27.3	27.3	27.3	54.5	18.2
OTTER TAIL	33.3	16.7	50.0	27.3	27.3	45.5
PENNINGTON	91.7	0.0	8.3	36.4	54.5	9.1
POLK	100.0	0.0	0.0	54.5	36.4	9.1
REDLAKE	100.0	0.0	0.0	81.8	18.2	0.0
ROSEAU	40.0	50.0	10.0	30.0	50.0	20.0
TODD	33.3	41.7	25.0	25.0	50.0	25.0
WADENA	81.8	18.2	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
WILKIN	66.7	16.7	16.7	50.0	16.7	33.3
TOTAL	62.3	22.1	15.6	43.0	39.6	17.4

Table 4A. Expansion through the exchange of work

Question: Do you feel that Extension agents in your county should spend much time in exchange with other counties?

Southwest District	Agricultural program Yes	Neutral	No	Home program Yes	Neutral	No
	Percent answering for each response					
BIG STONE	87.5	12.5	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
CHIPPEWA	75.0	16.7	8.3	66.7	25.0	8.3
COTTONWOOD	80.0	20.0	0.0	70.0	20.0	10.0
DOUGLAS	54.5	18.2	27.3	50.0	25.0	25.0
GRANT	81.8	9.1	9.1	54.5	36.4	9.1
JACKSON	66.7	33.3	0.0	8.3	75.0	16.7
LAC QUI PA	58.3	25.0	16.7	33.3	41.7	25.0
LINCOLN	36.4	36.4	27.3	18.2	45.5	36.4
LYON	60.0	30.0	10.0	30.0	40.0	30.0
MURRAY	54.5	36.4	9.1	45.5	45.5	9.1
NOBLES	70.0	20.0	10.0	60.0	40.0	0.0
PIPESTONE	80.0	0.0	20.0	70.0	10.0	20.0
POPE	81.8	0.0	18.2	63.6	27.3	9.1
REDWOOD	37.5	37.5	25.0	37.5	37.5	25.0
ROCK	75.0	16.7	8.3	45.5	54.5	0.0
STEVENS	90.9	0.0	9.1	63.6	9.1	27.3
SWIFT	81.8	0.0	18.2	54.5	27.3	18.2
TRAVERSE	60.0	40.0	0.0	55.6	44.4	0.0
YELLOW MED	72.7	9.1	18.2	70.0	10.0	20.0
TOTAL	68.8	18.8	12.4	49.5	35.0	15.5

Table 4A. Expansion through the exchange of work

Question: Do you feel that Extension agents in your county should spend much time in exchange with other counties?

Southeast District	Agricultural program Percent answering for each response			Home program Percent answering for each response		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BLUE EARTH	88.9	11.1	0.0	33.3	66.7	0.0
BROWN	50.0	33.3	16.7	16.7	66.7	16.7
DODGE	58.3	33.3	8.3	41.7	41.7	16.7
FARIBAULT	75.0	16.7	8.3	58.3	33.3	8.3
FILLMORE	55.6	33.3	11.1	44.4	33.3	22.2
FREEBORN	62.5	37.5	0.0	37.5	62.5	0.0
GOODHUE	58.3	25.0	16.7	25.0	41.7	33.3
HOUSTON	91.7	8.3	0.0	54.5	45.5	0.0
LE SUEUR	41.7	41.7	16.7	8.3	58.3	33.3
MARTIN	66.7	33.3	0.0	42.9	57.1	0.0
MOWER	55.6	44.4	0.0	22.2	44.4	33.3
NICOLLET	71.4	28.6	0.0	60.0	40.0	0.0
OLMSTED	75.0	25.0	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0
RICE	77.8	11.1	11.1	55.6	44.4	0.0
STEELE	66.7	25.0	8.3	63.6	18.2	18.2
WABASHA	91.7	8.3	0.0	63.6	18.2	18.2
WASECA	75.0	25.0	0.0	58.3	41.7	0.0
WATONWAN	91.7	8.3	0.0	58.3	41.7	0.0
WINONA	50.0	50.0	0.0	40.0	50.0	10.0
TOTAL	68.8	25.7	5.4	45.1	43.1	11.8

Table 4A. Expansion through the exchange of work

Question: Do you feel that Extension agents in your county should spend much time in exchanges with other counties?

Central District	Percent answering for each response: Agricultural program Yes	Neutral	No	Home program Yes	Neutral	No
ANOKA	40.0	30.0	30.0	50.0	30.0	20.0
BENTON	75.0	16.7	8.3	66.7	25.0	8.3
CARVER	36.4	36.4	27.3	18.2	54.5	27.3
CHISAGO	36.4	54.5	9.1	27.3	63.6	9.1
DAKOTA	44.4	33.3	22.2	33.3	44.4	22.2
HENNEPIN	50.0	50.0	0.0	60.0	40.0	0.0
ISANTI	75.0	16.7	8.3	66.7	25.0	8.3
KANDIYOHI	58.3	16.7	25.0	33.3	33.3	33.3
MCLEOD	75.0	16.7	8.3	54.5	36.4	9.1
MEEKER	41.7	25.0	33.3	36.4	36.4	27.3
MILLE LACS	44.4	55.6	0.0	33.3	55.6	11.1
RAMSEY	42.9	28.6	28.6	57.1	42.9	0.0
RENVILLE	72.7	18.2	9.1	72.7	18.2	9.1
SCOTT	72.7	9.1	18.2	54.5	18.2	27.3
SHERBURNE	75.0	16.7	8.3	45.5	45.5	9.1
SIBLEY	83.3	16.7	0.0	63.6	27.3	9.1
STEARNS	54.5	27.3	18.2	45.5	36.4	18.2
WASHINGTON	75.0	25.0	0.0	41.7	41.7	16.7
WRIGHT	50.0	16.7	33.3	41.7	16.7	41.7
TOTAL	59.1	26.0	14.9	47.5	35.8	16.7

Table 4A. Expansion through the exchange of work

Question: Do you feel that Extension agents in your county should spend much time in exchanges with other counties?

Northeast District	Agricultural program			Home program		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
	Percent answering for each response					
AITKIN	66.7	8.3	25.0	27.3	36.4	36.4
BELTRAMI	83.3	16.7	0.0	60.0	30.0	10.0
CARLTON	91.7	8.3	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0
CASS	36.4	36.4	27.3	18.2	54.5	27.3
CLEARWATER	75.0	25.0	0.0	36.4	45.5	18.2
COOK	37.5	12.5	50.0	55.6	33.3	11.1
CROW WING	60.0	40.0	0.0	30.0	50.0	20.0
HUBBARD	66.7	22.2	11.1	44.4	44.4	11.1
ITASCA	70.0	30.0	0.0	55.6	44.4	0.0
KANABEC	90.0	10.0	10.0	40.0	50.0	10.0
KOOCHICHIN	40.0	20.0	20.0	40.0	40.0	20.0
LAKE	87.5	12.5	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0
LAKE WOODS	91.7	0.0	8.3	36.4	54.5	9.1
MORRISON	50.0	50.0	0.0	41.7	50.0	8.3
PINE	75.0	16.7	8.3	66.7	25.0	8.3
ST. LOUIS	83.3	16.7	0.0	81.8	9.1	9.1
District TOTAL	70.3	20.3	9.3	48.8	38.6	12.7
State TOTAL	65.9	22.7	11.4	46.9	38.3	14.8

Table 5A. Expansion through increasing the areas of specialization

Question: Do you feel that Extension agents in your county should give help to schools, county health groups, towns, art groups, and groups interested in mental health?

Percent answering for each response

Northwest District	Schools			County health			Towns			Art groups			Mental illness		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BECKER	22.2	77.8	0.0	33.3	55.6	11.1	66.7	11.1	22.2	0.0	55.6	44.4	66.7	22.2	11.1
CLAY	16.7	58.3	25.0	16.7	66.7	16.7	41.7	41.7	16.7	0.0	58.3	41.7	0.0	58.3	41.7
KITTSON	0.0	44.4	55.6	20.0	50.0	30.0	33.3	55.6	11.1	11.1	22.2	66.7	20.0	40.0	40.0
MAHNOMEN	0.0	50.0	50.0	16.7	50.0	33.3	50.0	16.7	33.3	0.0	66.7	33.3	66.7	33.3	0.0
MARSHALL	40.0	40.0	20.0	36.4	27.3	36.4	50.0	40.0	10.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	27.3	54.5	18.2
NORMAN	10.0	60.0	30.0	30.0	60.0	10.0	70.0	10.0	20.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	30.0	60.0	10.0
OTTER TAIL	20.0	30.0	50.0	50.0	20.0	30.0	72.7	27.3	0.0	0.0	30.0	70.0	30.0	50.0	20.0
PENNINGTON	0.0	60.0	40.0	30.0	50.0	20.0	36.4	54.5	9.1	10.0	50.0	40.0	27.3	54.5	18.2
POLK	12.5	50.0	37.5	12.5	37.5	50.0	33.3	44.4	22.2	0.0	50.0	50.0	44.4	22.2	33.3
RED LAKE	22.2	55.6	22.2	22.2	77.8	0.0	55.6	33.3	11.1	0.0	55.6	44.4	22.2	77.8	0.0
ROSEAU	22.2	44.4	33.3	22.2	55.6	22.2	33.3	55.6	11.1	11.1	22.2	66.7	30.0	50.0	20.0
TOTAL	27.3	45.5	27.3	27.3	54.5	18.2	45.5	45.5	9.1	18.2	54.5	27.3	45.5	36.4	18.2
WASCOSA	0.0	44.4	55.6	0.0	77.8	22.2	22.2	33.3	44.4	0.0	22.2	77.8	11.1	55.6	33.3
WILKIN	25.0	25.0	50.0	25.0	41.7	33.3	50.0	33.3	16.7	8.3	41.7	50.0	25.0	50.0	25.0
TOTAL	16.4	48.5	35.1	25.0	51.5	23.5	47.4	36.5	16.1	4.5	44.8	50.7	30.2	48.2	21.6

Table 5A. Expansion through increasing the areas of specialization

Question: Do you feel that Extension agents in your county should give help to schools, county health groups, towns, art groups, and groups interested in mental health?

Percent answering for each response

Southwest District	Schools			County health			Towns			Art groups			Mental illness		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BIG STONE	28.6	57.1	14.3	71.4	28.6	0.0	62.5	37.5	0.0	28.6	57.1	14.3	28.6	71.4	0.0
CHIPPEWA	9.1	36.4	54.5	30.0	30.0	40.0	20.0	50.0	30.0	0.0	60.0	40.0	44.4	22.2	33.3
COTTONWOOD	10.0	30.0	60.0	10.0	70.0	20.0	30.0	50.0	20.0	10.0	70.0	20.0	40.0	40.0	20.0
DOUGLAS	20.0	30.0	50.0	20.0	40.0	40.0	18.2	36.4	45.5	0.0	20.0	80.0	20.0	50.0	30.0
GRANT	18.2	54.5	27.3	9.1	54.5	36.4	54.5	36.4	9.1	18.2	45.5	36.4	54.5	27.3	18.2
JACKSON	0.0	50.0	50.0	11.1	66.7	22.2	30.0	50.0	20.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	30.0	50.0	20.0
LAC QUI PA	8.3	58.3	33.3	18.2	63.6	18.2	54.5	27.3	18.2	10.0	60.0	30.0	45.5	36.4	18.2
LINCOLN	20.0	10.0	70.0	10.0	50.0	40.0	27.3	45.5	27.3	20.0	40.0	40.0	22.2	55.6	22.2
LYON	22.2	44.4	33.3	22.2	33.3	44.4	30.0	50.0	20.0	0.0	55.6	44.4	12.5	62.5	25.0
MURRAY	0.0	45.5	54.5	10.0	60.0	30.0	18.2	45.5	36.4	9.1	27.3	63.6	36.4	36.4	27.3
NOBLES	44.4	22.2	33.3	50.0	40.0	10.0	70.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	70.0	20.0	10.0
PIPESTONE	10.0	60.0	30.0	10.0	80.0	10.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	30.0	50.0	20.0	40.0	60.0	0.0
POPE	40.0	30.0	30.0	40.0	50.0	10.0	30.0	30.0	40.0	30.0	40.0	30.0	30.0	40.0	30.0
REDWOOD	14.3	42.9	42.9	14.3	57.1	28.6	71.4	0.0	28.6	14.3	57.1	28.6	42.9	42.9	14.3
ROCK	22.2	44.4	33.3	30.0	60.0	10.0	45.5	27.3	27.3	0.0	75.0	25.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
STEVENS	10.0	30.0	60.0	10.0	30.0	60.0	20.0	70.0	10.0	0.0	40.0	60.0	30.0	40.0	30.0
SWIFT	0.0	57.1	42.9	0.0	85.7	14.3	25.0	62.5	12.5	14.3	71.4	14.3	50.0	50.0	0.0
TRAVERSE	11.1	44.4	44.4	0.0	66.7	33.3	11.1	77.8	11.1	0.0	77.8	22.2	11.1	55.6	33.3
YELLOW MED	22.2	66.7	11.1	33.3	66.7	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	55.6	44.4	22.2	66.7	11.1
TOTAL	16.0	43.6	40.3	20.7	54.2	25.1	37.4	42.2	20.3	9.7	51.7	38.6	36.3	45.3	18.4

Table 5A. Expansion through increasing the areas of specialization

Question: Do you feel that Extension agents in your county should give help to schools, county health groups, towns, art groups, and groups interested in mental health?

Percent answering for each response

Southeast District	Schools			County health			Towns			Art groups			Mental illness		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BLUE EARTH	20.0	0.0	80.0	30.0	30.0	40.0	60.0	30.0	10.0	22.2	11.1	66.7	30.0	30.0	40.0
BROWN	20.0	50.0	30.0	33.3	44.4	22.2	18.2	36.4	45.5	0.0	60.0	40.0	60.0	30.0	10.0
DODGE	10.0	60.0	30.0	30.0	50.0	20.0	45.5	36.4	18.2	0.0	60.0	40.0	30.0	50.0	20.0
FAIRBAULT	0.0	8.3	91.7	0.0	41.7	58.3	58.3	16.7	25.0	0.0	8.3	91.7	8.3	50.0	41.7
FILLMORE	33.3	33.3	33.3	33.3	33.3	33.3	11.1	77.8	11.1	0.0	55.6	44.4	11.1	55.6	33.3
FREEBORN	0.0	75.0	25.0	25.0	37.5	37.5	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	62.5	37.5	12.5	62.5	25.0
GOODHUE	0.0	37.5	62.5	22.2	11.1	66.7	11.1	33.3	55.6	12.5	12.5	75.0	22.2	33.3	44.4
HOUSTON	27.3	45.5	27.3	18.2	45.5	36.4	27.3	54.5	18.2	27.3	45.5	27.3	30.0	50.0	20.0
LE SUEUR	25.0	41.7	33.3	25.0	41.7	33.3	50.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	66.7	33.3	33.3	50.0	16.7
MARTIN	33.3	33.3	33.3	28.6	57.1	14.3	37.5	25.0	37.5	16.7	50.0	33.3	42.9	28.6	28.6
MOWER	28.6	57.1	14.3	16.7	66.7	16.7	57.1	28.6	14.3	0.0	42.9	57.1	14.3	42.9	42.9
NICOLLET	50.0	33.3	16.7	33.3	66.7	0.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	20.0	40.0	40.0	50.0	33.3	16.7
OLMSTED	8.3	58.3	33.3	9.1	72.7	18.2	83.3	16.7	0.0	0.0	63.6	36.4	9.1	63.6	27.3
RICE	0.0	42.9	57.1	0.0	42.9	57.1	62.5	12.5	25.0	0.0	42.9	57.1	14.3	28.6	57.1
STEELE	18.2	36.4	45.5	27.3	45.5	27.3	45.5	27.3	27.3	9.1	45.5	45.5	10.0	70.0	20.0
WABASHA	20.0	50.0	30.0	30.0	50.0	20.0	70.0	10.0	20.0	10.0	70.0	20.0	40.0	50.0	10.0
WASECA	25.0	33.3	41.7	25.0	25.0	50.0	25.0	33.3	41.7	16.7	41.7	41.7	41.7	33.3	25.0
WATONWAN	9.1	72.7	18.2	16.7	75.0	8.3	16.7	75.0	8.3	25.0	50.0	25.0	63.6	36.4	0.0
WINONA	25.0	37.5	37.5	25.0	37.5	37.5	37.5	25.0	37.5	12.5	50.0	37.5	44.4	22.2	33.3
TOTAL	17.8	42.2	40.0	22.2	45.6	32.2	42.5	32.3	25.3	9.0	46.6	44.4	30.0	43.9	26.1

Table 5A. Expansion through increasing the areas of specialization

Question: Do you feel that Extension agents in your county should give help to schools, county health groups, towns, art groups, and groups interested in mental health?

Central District	Percent answering for each response														
	Schools			County health			Towns			Art groups			Mental illness		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
ANOKA	0.0	87.5	12.5	44.4	44.4	11.1	90.0	10.0	0.0	22.2	66.7	11.1	33.3	44.4	22.2
BENTON	11.1	66.7	22.2	40.0	60.0	0.0	44.4	55.6	0.0	0.0	87.5	12.5	22.2	66.7	11.1
CARVER	0.0	50.0	50.0	36.4	45.5	18.2	63.6	18.2	18.2	9.1	54.5	36.4	36.4	36.4	27.3
CHISAGO	18.2	36.4	45.5	10.0	40.0	50.0	30.0	50.0	20.0	9.1	9.1	81.8	9.1	45.5	45.5
DAKOTA	37.5	50.0	12.5	55.6	44.4	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	22.2	55.6	22.2	33.3	55.6	11.1
HENNEPIN	22.2	44.4	33.3	44.4	44.4	11.1	66.7	33.3	0.0	44.4	44.4	11.1	55.6	44.4	0.0
ISANTI	0.0	81.8	18.2	9.1	81.8	9.1	18.2	81.8	0.0	18.2	81.8	0.0	9.1	90.9	0.0
KANDIYOHI	30.0	30.0	40.0	40.0	30.0	30.0	60.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	40.0	40.0	50.0	30.0	20.0
MCLEOD	0.0	54.5	45.5	10.0	60.0	30.0	54.5	36.4	9.1	9.1	36.4	54.5	27.3	36.4	36.4
MEEKER	10.0	40.0	50.0	18.2	45.5	36.4	36.4	45.5	18.2	0.0	45.5	54.5	41.7	41.7	16.7
MILLE LACS	0.0	62.5	37.5	25.0	25.0	50.0	12.5	50.0	37.5	0.0	75.0	25.0	12.5	50.0	37.5
RAMSEY	14.3	71.4	14.3	28.6	57.1	14.3	50.0	50.0	0.0	28.6	71.4	0.0	71.4	28.6	0.0
RENVILLE	18.2	45.5	36.4	18.2	45.5	36.4	36.4	54.5	9.1	9.1	45.5	45.5	54.5	36.4	9.1
SCOTT	37.5	25.0	37.5	37.5	37.5	25.0	50.0	12.5	37.5	12.5	37.5	50.0	37.5	25.0	37.5
SHERBURNE	9.1	63.6	27.3	18.2	63.6	18.2	81.8	18.2	0.0	10.0	70.0	20.0	27.3	63.6	9.1
SIBLEY	40.0	40.0	20.0	30.0	50.0	20.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	40.0	30.0	30.0	70.0	10.0	20.0
STEARNS	37.5	25.0	37.5	25.0	37.5	37.5	55.6	33.3	11.1	12.5	50.0	37.5	25.0	50.0	25.0
WASHINGTON	0.0	45.5	54.5	25.0	41.7	33.3	58.3	33.3	8.3	0.0	63.6	36.4	41.7	41.7	16.7
WRIGHT	27.3	36.4	36.4	36.4	36.4	27.3	36.4	45.5	18.2	10.0	40.0	50.0	20.0	60.0	20.0
TOTAL	15.9	50.0	34.1	28.5	47.3	24.2	50.3	38.0	11.6	14.2	51.9	33.9	35.3	45.5	19.3

Table 5A. Expansion through increasing the areas of specialization

Question: Do you feel that Extension agents in your county should give help to schools, county health groups, towns, art groups, and groups interested in mental health?

Percent answering for each response

Northeast District	Schools			County health			Towns			Art groups			Mental illness		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
AITKIN	0.0	60.0	40.0	36.4	36.4	27.3	30.0	50.0	20.0	36.4	36.4	27.3	27.3	36.4	36.4
BELTRAMI	20.0	50.0	30.0	27.3	27.3	45.5	63.6	36.4	0.0	20.0	60.0	20.0	30.0	40.0	30.0
CARLTON	25.0	58.3	16.7	66.7	33.3	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	8.3	75.0	16.7	41.7	50.0	8.3
CASS	0.0	66.7	33.3	22.2	55.6	22.2	50.0	30.0	20.0	11.1	44.4	44.4	33.3	33.3	33.3
CLEARWATER	10.0	50.0	40.0	22.2	55.6	22.2	33.3	44.4	22.2	11.1	55.6	33.3	33.3	33.3	33.3
COOK	25.0	37.5	37.5	25.0	50.0	25.0	44.4	22.2	33.3	37.5	12.5	50.0	33.3	22.2	44.4
CROW WING	14.3	71.4	14.3	50.0	37.5	12.5	42.9	42.9	14.3	0.0	57.1	42.9	37.5	62.5	0.0
HUBBARD	25.0	37.5	37.5	33.3	55.6	11.1	66.7	33.3	0.0	12.5	87.5	0.0	22.2	55.6	22.2
ITASCA	25.0	25.0	50.0	25.0	25.0	50.0	33.3	55.6	11.1	0.0	37.5	62.5	57.1	28.6	14.3
KANABEC	0.0	50.0	50.0	30.0	50.0	20.0	40.0	50.0	10.0	10.0	70.0	20.0	30.0	60.0	10.0
KOOCHICHIN	11.1	33.3	55.6	22.2	33.3	44.4	70.0	10.0	20.0	0.0	33.3	66.7	40.0	30.0	30.0
LAKE	0.0	62.5	37.5	0.0	87.5	12.5	37.5	50.0	12.5	0.0	37.5	62.5	25.0	62.5	12.5
LAKE WOODS	27.3	54.5	18.2	27.3	54.5	18.2	25.0	58.3	16.7	9.1	63.6	27.3	72.7	18.2	9.1
MORRISON	16.7	50.0	33.3	16.7	66.7	16.7	66.7	16.7	16.7	25.0	58.3	16.7	33.3	58.3	8.3
PINE	27.3	36.4	36.4	20.0	60.0	20.0	40.0	60.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	20.0	80.0	0.0
ST. LOUIS	57.1	42.9	0.0	14.3	57.1	28.6	72.7	18.2	9.1	0.0	50.0	50.0	37.5	50.0	12.5
District TOTAL	17.3	49.3	33.3	28.3	48.7	23.0	50.3	37.1	12.6	12.2	52.7	35.1	35.9	45.1	19.0
State TOTAL	16.7	46.6	36.8	24.8	49.3	25.8	45.3	37.3	17.4	10.1	49.7	40.2	33.7	45.5	20.9

Table 5B. Expansion through increasing the areas of specialization (help to citizens with legal problems, help to law enforcement agencies, local businesses, local industries, and home builders)

Question: What kinds of additional assistance, if any, should be provided to counties by specialists of other parts of the University?

Percent answering for each response

Northwest District	Legal problems			Law enforcement			Local business			Local industry			Home builders		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	N
BECKER	22.2	44.4	33.3	50.0	40.0	10.0	30.0	70.0	0.0	50.0	40.0	10.0	0.0	77.8	22.
CLAY	33.3	41.7	25.0	25.0	41.7	33.3	25.0	58.3	16.7	41.7	33.3	25.0	41.7	33.3	25.
KITTSON	40.0	40.0	20.0	40.0	20.0	40.0	22.2	55.6	22.2	22.2	66.7	11.1	33.3	55.6	11.
MAHNOMEN	85.7	14.3	0.0	85.7	14.3	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3	28.6	42.9	28.6	33.3	50.0	16.
MARSHALL	36.4	45.5	18.2	54.5	36.4	9.1	20.0	30.0	50.0	50.0	40.0	10.0	10.0	70.0	20.
NORMAN	55.6	11.1	33.3	60.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	60.0	20.0	30.0	60.0	10.0	30.0	40.0	30.
OTTER TAIL	40.0	30.0	30.0	45.5	27.3	27.3	20.0	40.0	40.0	36.4	18.2	45.5	10.0	50.0	40.
PENNINGTON	20.0	50.0	30.0	58.3	33.3	8.3	27.3	63.6	9.1	63.6	36.4	0.0	45.5	45.5	9.
POLK	66.7	0.0	33.3	37.5	25.0	37.5	44.4	11.1	44.4	55.6	0.0	44.4	0.0	62.5	37.
REDLAKE	80.0	20.0	0.0	50.0	40.0	10.0	11.1	55.6	33.3	11.1	66.7	22.2	44.4	33.3	22.
ROSEAU	33.3	44.4	22.2	44.4	22.2	33.3	22.2	44.4	33.3	50.0	40.0	10.0	44.4	44.4	11.
TODD	60.0	30.0	10.0	63.6	18.2	18.2	30.0	60.0	10.0	60.0	40.0	0.0	54.5	36.4	9.
WADENA	22.2	44.4	33.3	22.2	44.4	33.3	30.0	50.0	20.0	33.3	55.6	11.1	11.1	44.4	44.
WILKIN	50.0	16.7	33.3	33.3	33.3	33.3	33.3	50.0	16.7	41.7	33.3	25.0	16.7	50.0	33.
TOTAL	45.3	31.4	23.4	47.2	30.3	22.5	26.3	49.4	24.1	41.7	40.3	18.0	27.4	48.9	23.

Table 5B. Expansion through increasing the areas of specialization (help to citizens with legal problems, help to law enforcement agencies, local businesses, local industries, and home builders)

Question: What kinds of additional assistance, if any, should be provided to counties by specialists of other parts of the University?

Percent answering for each response

Southwest District	Legal problems			Law enforcement			Local business			Local industry			Home builders		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BIG STONE	71.4	28.6	0.0	57.1	28.6	14.3	14.3	85.7	0.0	50.0	37.5	12.5	75.0	12.5	12.5
CHIPPEWA	50.0	40.0	10.0	36.4	36.4	27.3	36.4	36.4	27.3	36.4	54.5	9.1	30.0	50.0	20.0
COTTONWOOD	50.0	40.0	10.0	30.0	40.0	30.0	20.0	60.0	20.0	40.0	50.0	10.0	20.0	70.0	10.0
DOUGLAS	50.0	20.0	30.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	10.0	50.0	40.0	20.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	30.0	50.0
GRANT	45.5	45.5	9.1	54.5	45.5	0.0	18.2	63.6	18.2	27.3	54.5	18.2	54.5	27.3	18.2
JACKSON	30.0	40.0	30.0	45.5	36.4	18.2	10.0	70.0	20.0	30.0	60.0	10.0	20.0	30.0	50.0
LAC QUI PA	54.5	27.3	18.2	45.5	27.3	27.3	41.7	41.7	16.7	45.5	45.5	9.1	18.2	54.5	27.3
LINCOLN	45.5	36.4	18.2	40.0	60.0	0.0	30.0	20.0	50.0	30.0	20.0	50.0	10.0	60.0	30.0
LYON	44.4	44.4	11.1	66.7	33.3	0.0	33.3	11.1	55.6	77.8	11.1	11.1	22.2	55.6	22.2
MURRAY	63.6	27.3	9.1	54.5	18.2	27.3	20.0	50.0	30.0	72.7	18.2	9.1	18.2	45.5	36.4
NOBLES	77.8	11.1	11.1	44.4	44.4	11.1	22.2	44.4	33.3	22.2	33.3	44.4	25.0	37.5	37.5
PIPESTONE	40.0	20.0	40.0	30.0	40.0	30.0	40.0	50.0	10.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	22.2	55.6	22.2
POPE	60.0	20.0	20.0	55.6	22.2	22.2	55.6	33.3	11.1	44.4	44.4	11.1	50.0	50.0	0.0
REDWOOD	42.9	28.6	28.6	57.1	28.6	14.3	0.0	71.4	28.6	14.3	57.1	28.6	14.3	57.1	28.6
ROCK	50.0	40.0	10.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	50.0	30.0	20.0	20.0	60.0	20.0	20.0	50.0	30.0
STEVENS	30.0	30.0	40.0	30.0	50.0	20.0	20.0	60.0	20.0	10.0	70.0	20.0	10.0	50.0	40.0
SWIFT	62.5	37.5	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	14.3	85.7	0.0	14.3	85.7	0.0
TRAVERSE	44.4	33.3	22.2	55.6	22.2	22.2	33.3	55.6	11.1	33.3	66.7	0.0	22.2	44.4	33.3
YELLOW MED	50.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	30.0	20.0	22.2	77.8	0.0	33.3	44.4	22.2	0.0	77.8	22.2
TOTAL	50.3	32.8	16.9	45.9	36.6	17.5	26.1	51.7	22.2	35.9	47.0	17.1	24.6	49.2	26.3

Table 5B. Expansion through increasing the areas of specialization (help to citizens with legal problems, help to law enforcement agencies, local businesses, local industries, and home builders)

Question: What kinds of additional assistance, if any, should be provided to counties by specialists of other parts of the University?

Percent answering for each response

Southeast District	Legal problems			Law enforcement			Local business			Local industry			Home builders		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BLUE EARTH	50.0	20.0	30.0	63.6	9.1	27.3	11.1	55.6	33.3	11.1	55.6	33.3	30.0	30.0	40.0
BROWN	30.0	60.0	10.0	63.6	18.2	18.2	45.5	27.3	27.3	20.0	40.0	40.0	30.0	40.0	30.0
DODGE	91.7	8.3	0.0	80.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	60.0	20.0	30.0	30.0	40.0	30.0	70.0	0.0
FARIBAULT	33.3	25.0	41.7	41.7	41.7	16.7	16.7	25.0	58.3	8.3	41.7	50.0	33.3	33.3	33.3
FILLMORE	55.6	22.2	22.2	22.2	55.6	22.2	11.1	66.7	22.2	22.2	33.3	44.4	44.4	33.3	22.2
FREEBORN	62.5	12.5	25.0	37.5	37.5	25.0	12.5	37.5	50.0	12.5	25.0	62.5	25.0	62.5	12.5
GOODHUE	12.5	37.5	50.0	37.5	12.5	50.0	0.0	55.6	44.4	0.0	44.4	55.6	0.0	55.6	44.4
HOUSTON	45.5	45.5	9.1	36.4	36.4	27.3	41.7	41.7	16.7	45.5	36.4	18.2	50.0	50.0	0.0
LE SUEUR	50.0	41.7	8.3	33.3	50.0	16.7	25.0	58.3	16.7	33.3	50.0	16.7	25.0	50.0	25.0
MARTIN	50.0	25.0	25.0	55.6	22.2	22.2	28.6	28.6	42.9	16.7	50.0	33.3	42.9	42.9	14.3
MOWER	57.1	28.6	14.3	50.0	25.0	25.0	28.6	14.3	57.1	12.5	62.5	25.0	14.3	71.4	14.3
NICOLLET	40.0	40.0	20.0	66.7	16.7	16.7	20.0	60.0	20.0	40.0	60.0	0.0	40.0	60.0	0.0
OLMSTED	45.5	36.4	18.2	58.3	33.3	8.3	33.3	58.3	8.3	16.7	50.0	33.3	27.3	54.5	18.2
RICE	37.5	12.5	50.0	37.5	37.5	25.0	25.0	12.5	62.5	25.0	25.0	50.0	28.6	14.3	57.1
STEELE	41.7	33.3	25.0	50.0	33.3	16.7	36.4	27.3	36.4	36.4	27.3	36.4	27.3	36.4	36.4
WABASHA	30.0	50.0	20.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	50.0	20.0	30.0	20.0	60.0	20.0	50.0	40.0	10.0
WASECA	58.3	25.0	16.7	58.3	25.0	16.7	16.7	41.7	41.7	25.0	33.3	41.7	50.0	33.3	16.7
WATONWAN	41.7	41.7	16.7	66.7	33.3	0.0	41.7	41.7	16.7	50.0	41.7	8.3	25.0	66.7	8.3
WINONA	55.6	11.1	33.3	50.0	25.0	25.0	29.0	37.5	37.5	14.3	28.6	57.1	25.0	37.5	37.5
TOTAL	47.3	30.6	22.0	50.3	30.7	19.0	26.6	40.8	32.6	23.8	41.4	34.8	31.7	46.1	22.2

Table 5B. Expansion through increasing the areas of specialization (help to citizens with legal problems, help to law enforcement agencies, local businesses, local industries, and home builders)

Question: What kinds of additional assistance, if any, should be provided to counties by specialists of other parts of the University?

Percent answering for each response

Central District	Legal problems			Law enforcement			Local business			Local industry			Home builders		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
ANOKA	50.0	20.0	30.0	55.6	22.2	22.2	33.3	44.4	22.2	55.6	33.3	11.1	44.4	33.3	22.
BENTON	63.6	27.3	9.1	50.0	40.0	10.0	22.2	66.7	11.1	33.3	55.6	11.1	44.4	55.6	0.
CARVER	36.4	27.3	36.4	27.3	45.5	27.3	10.0	60.0	30.0	30.0	60.0	10.0	27.3	54.5	18.
CHISAGO	36.4	36.4	27.3	40.0	20.0	40.0	18.2	54.5	27.3	45.5	54.5	0.0	40.0	20.0	40.
DAKOTA	55.6	22.2	22.2	77.8	22.2	0.0	0.0	62.5	37.5	22.2	44.4	33.3	22.2	44.4	33.
HENNEPIN	33.3	55.6	11.1	55.6	22.2	22.2	0.0	66.7	33.3	11.1	66.7	22.2	22.2	66.7	11.
ISANTI	45.5	45.5	9.1	36.4	63.6	0.0	27.3	72.7	0.0	36.4	63.6	0.0	18.2	81.8	0.
KANDIYOHI	54.5	18.2	27.3	72.7	18.2	9.1	45.5	18.2	36.4	50.0	20.0	30.0	40.0	30.0	30.
MC.ECD	63.6	18.2	18.2	75.0	8.3	16.7	20.0	50.0	30.0	0.0	40.0	60.0	70.0	10.0	20.
MEEKER	36.4	27.3	36.4	33.3	33.3	33.3	25.0	41.7	33.3	30.0	50.0	20.0	45.5	27.3	27.
MILLE LACS	12.5	37.5	50.0	37.5	37.5	25.0	25.0	50.0	25.0	25.0	50.0	25.0	37.5	37.5	25.
RAMSEY	57.1	28.6	14.3	42.9	57.1	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	33.3	66.7	0.0	33.3	66.7	C.
RENVILLE	27.3	54.5	18.2	36.4	45.5	18.2	18.2	54.5	27.3	36.4	27.3	36.4	0.0	63.6	36.
SCOTT	25.0	25.0	50.0	66.7	11.1	22.2	0.0	50.0	50.0	25.0	25.0	50.0	25.0	37.5	37.
SHERBURNE	36.4	45.5	18.2	54.5	45.5	0.0	18.2	72.7	9.1	25.0	58.3	16.7	36.4	45.5	18.
SIBLEY	60.0	20.0	20.0	60.0	30.0	10.0	20.0	60.0	20.0	50.0	40.0	10.0	60.0	20.0	20.
STEARNS	62.5	25.0	12.5	50.0	50.0	0.0	42.9	42.9	14.3	50.0	37.5	12.5	37.5	62.5	0.
WASHINGTON	36.4	27.3	36.4	50.0	25.0	25.0	9.1	45.5	45.5	36.4	27.3	36.4	9.1	45.5	45.
WRIGHT	36.4	36.4	27.3	66.7	16.7	16.7	10.0	40.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	30.0	20.0	50.
OTAL	43.7	31.6	24.7	52.1	31.8	16.1	20.3	52.7	26.9	31.3	45.6	23.1	33.5	42.9	23.

Table 5B. Expansion through increasing the areas of specialization (help to citizens with legal problems, help to law enforcement agencies, local businesses, local industries, and home builders)

Question: What kinds of additional assistance, if any, should be provided to counties by specialists of other parts of the University?

Percent answering for each response

Northeast District	Legal problems			Law enforcement			Local business			Local industry			Home builders		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
AITKIN	45.5	27.3	27.3	63.6	18.2	18.2	9.1	63.6	27.3	54.5	36.4	9.1	36.4	54.5	9.1
BELTRAMI	40.0	40.0	20.0	70.0	20.0	10.0	70.0	30.0	0.0	81.8	18.2	0.0	50.0	40.0	10.0
CARLTON	66.7	33.3	0.0	58.3	33.3	8.3	25.0	58.3	16.7	41.7	41.7	16.7	75.0	25.0	0.0
CASS	70.0	10.0	20.0	40.0	50.0	10.0	22.2	55.6	22.2	33.3	55.6	11.1	11.1	66.7	22.2
CLEARWATER	70.0	20.0	10.0	63.6	18.2	18.2	12.5	50.0	37.5	40.0	40.0	20.0	44.4	33.3	22.2
COOK	33.3	33.3	33.3	55.6	0.0	44.4	50.0	37.5	12.5	55.6	33.3	11.1	60.0	10.0	30.0
CROW WING	62.5	12.5	25.0	71.4	28.6	0.0	28.6	57.1	14.3	50.0	37.5	12.5	25.0	50.0	25.0
HUBBARD	77.8	11.1	11.1	44.4	44.4	11.1	37.5	62.5	0.0	37.5	62.5	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0
ITASCA	55.6	22.2	22.2	66.7	11.1	22.2	25.0	37.5	37.5	55.6	33.3	11.1	12.5	75.0	12.5
KANABEC	40.0	40.0	20.0	60.0	30.0	10.0	11.1	55.6	33.3	30.0	40.0	30.0	30.0	60.0	10.0
KOOCHICHIN	60.0	20.0	20.0	33.3	22.2	44.4	22.2	55.6	22.2	11.1	55.6	33.3	30.0	60.0	10.0
LAKE	25.0	50.0	25.0	12.5	50.0	37.5	25.0	50.0	25.0	62.5	25.0	12.5	37.5	50.0	12.5
LAKE WOODS	63.6	18.2	18.2	50.0	33.3	16.7	0.0	81.8	18.2	25.0	58.3	16.7	81.8	9.1	9.1
MORRISON	41.7	33.3	25.0	66.7	16.7	16.7	41.7	25.0	33.3	50.0	25.0	25.0	33.3	50.0	16.7
PINE	54.5	27.3	18.2	54.5	45.5	0.0	55.6	44.4	0.0	63.6	36.4	0.0	20.0	70.0	10.0
ST. LOUIS	55.6	33.3	11.1	85.7	0.0	14.3	57.1	28.6	14.3	71.4	14.3	14.3	50.0	37.5	12.5
District TOTAL	54.1	27.0	18.9	56.1	26.8	17.2	30.1	50.0	19.9	47.4	38.5	14.1	42.6	44.5	12.9
State TOTAL	48.1	30.8	21.2	56.3	31.4	18.3	25.7	48.9	25.5	35.4	42.8	21.8	31.9	46.2	21.9

Table 6A. Expansion through public affairs meetings (domestic agriculture, foreign agriculture, problems of local government, and taxation)

Question: Do you feel Extension agents in your county should sponsor educational programs on public affairs issues?

Percent answering for each response

Northwest District	Domestic agriculture			Foreign agriculture			Problems of government			Taxation		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BECKER	72.7	27.3	0.0	40.0	30.0	30.0	44.4	33.3	22.2	30.0	60.0	10.0
CLAY	50.0	33.3	16.7	16.7	50.0	33.3	33.3	41.7	25.0	25.0	33.3	41.7
KITTSON	30.0	60.0	10.0	10.0	70.0	20.0	18.2	45.5	36.4	20.0	30.0	50.0
MAHNOMEN	57.1	14.3	28.6	0.0	57.1	42.9	57.1	28.6	14.3	28.6	42.9	28.6
MARSHALL	60.0	20.0	20.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	40.0	20.0	40.0	50.0	10.0	40.0
NORMAN	50.0	30.0	20.0	20.0	50.0	30.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	30.0	30.0	40.0
OTTER TAIL	20.0	40.0	40.0	10.0	40.0	50.0	9.1	63.6	27.3	0.0	60.0	40.0
PENNINGTON	72.7	18.2	9.1	72.7	18.2	9.1	50.3	16.7	25.0	16.7	41.7	41.7
POLK	80.0	10.0	10.0	33.3	44.4	22.2	25.0	37.5	37.5	33.3	33.3	33.3
RED LAKE	70.0	30.0	0.0	40.0	30.0	30.0	30.0	40.0	30.0	30.0	10.0	60.0
ROSEAU	70.0	20.0	10.0	22.2	66.7	11.1	40.0	30.0	30.0	11.1	33.3	55.6
TODD	91.7	0.0	8.3	27.3	45.5	27.3	27.3	45.5	27.3	33.3	33.3	33.3
WADENA	60.0	30.0	10.0	0.0	66.7	33.3	11.1	66.7	22.2	11.1	66.7	22.2
WILKIN	33.3	41.7	25.0	16.7	41.7	41.7	33.3	25.0	41.7	33.3	16.7	50.0
TOTAL	58.6	26.9	14.5	29.7	49.7	20.6	33.1	38.0	28.9	25.4	35.2	39.4

Table 6A. Expansion through public affairs meetings (domestic agriculture, foreign agriculture, problems of local government, and taxation)

Question: Do you feel Extension agents in your county should sponsor educational programs on public affairs issues?

Percent answering for each response

Southwest District	Domestic agriculture			Foreign agriculture			Problems of government			Taxation		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BIG STONE	87.5	12.5	0.0	37.5	62.5	0.0	62.5	37.5	0.0	12.5	75.0	12.5
CHIPPEWA	50.0	50.0	0.0	36.4	45.5	18.2	36.4	18.2	45.5	27.3	27.3	45.5
COTTONWOOD	80.0	10.0	10.0	60.0	20.0	20.0	50.0	30.0	20.0	40.0	40.0	20.0
DOUGLAS	41.7	25.0	33.3	18.2	45.5	36.4	33.3	33.3	33.3	25.0	41.7	33.3
GRANT	81.8	18.2	0.0	63.6	36.4	0.0	72.7	18.2	9.1	45.5	45.5	9.1
JACKSON	66.7	25.0	8.3	25.0	58.3	16.7	41.7	50.0	8.3	50.0	25.0	25.0
LAC QUI PA	66.7	16.7	16.7	27.3	36.4	36.4	9.1	45.5	45.5	27.3	36.4	36.4
LINCOLN	72.7	18.2	9.1	36.4	36.4	27.3	18.2	54.5	27.3	27.3	54.5	18.2
LYON	66.7	11.1	22.2	55.6	22.2	22.2	11.1	33.3	55.6	11.1	33.3	55.6
MURRAY	72.7	18.2	9.1	18.2	63.6	18.2	27.3	45.5	27.3	36.4	18.2	45.5
NOBLES	77.8	11.1	11.1	50.0	10.0	40.0	20.0	50.0	30.0	10.0	40.0	50.0
PIPESTONE	50.0	20.0	30.0	0.0	40.0	60.0	50.0	20.0	30.0	40.0	20.0	40.0
POPE	72.7	18.2	9.1	18.2	72.7	9.1	36.4	36.4	27.3	18.2	45.5	36.4
REDWOOD	87.5	12.5	0.0	25.0	50.0	25.0	62.5	25.0	12.5	37.5	37.5	25.0
ROCK	75.0	16.7	8.3	33.3	16.7	50.0	30.0	50.0	20.0	41.7	41.7	16.7
STEVENS	36.4	54.5	9.1	9.1	45.5	45.5	18.2	36.4	45.5	18.2	27.3	54.5
SWIFT	72.7	27.3	0.0	55.6	33.3	11.1	50.0	50.0	0.0	45.5	54.5	0.0
TRAVERSE	70.0	20.0	10.0	20.0	50.0	30.0	10.0	40.0	50.0	20.0	30.0	50.0
YELLOW MED	77.8	22.2	0.0	55.6	44.4	0.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	40.0	50.0	10.0
TOTAL	67.8	22.1	10.1	33.3	41.5	25.1	35.2	37.8	27.0	30.7	38.7	30.7

Table 6A. Expansion through public affairs meetings (domestic agriculture, foreign agriculture, problems of local government, and taxation)

Question: Do you feel Extension agents in your county should sponsor educational programs on public affairs issues?

Percent answering for each response

Southeast District	Domestic agriculture			Foreign agriculture			Problems of government			Taxation		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BLUE EARTH	55.6	33.3	11.1	22.2	44.4	33.3	18.2	36.4	45.5	11.1	44.4	44.4
BROWN	45.5	36.4	18.2	45.5	36.4	18.2	45.5	36.4	18.2	45.5	36.4	18.2
DODGE	75.0	16.7	8.3	16.7	50.0	33.3	50.0	33.3	16.7	50.0	25.0	25.0
FARIBAULT	66.7	8.3	25.0	41.7	33.3	25.0	50.0	25.0	25.0	41.7	41.7	16.7
FILLMORE	66.7	22.2	11.1	33.3	33.3	33.3	22.2	44.4	33.3	22.2	33.3	44.4
FREEBORN	87.5	12.5	0.0	25.0	62.5	12.5	37.5	25.0	37.5	37.5	37.5	25.0
GOODHUE	75.0	8.3	16.7	41.7	33.3	25.0	66.7	0.0	33.3	50.0	8.3	41.7
HOUSTON	63.6	36.4	0.0	36.4	45.5	18.2	36.4	54.5	9.1	40.0	30.0	30.0
LE SUEUR	41.7	25.0	33.3	25.0	33.3	41.7	8.3	33.3	58.3	0.0	16.7	83.3
MARTIN	66.7	33.3	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	25.0	50.0	25.0	77.8	11.1	11.1
MOWER	70.0	20.0	10.0	55.6	11.1	33.3	44.4	22.2	33.3	22.2	44.4	33.3
NICOLLET	57.1	14.3	28.6	20.0	20.0	60.0	33.3	16.7	50.0	33.3	33.3	33.3
OLMSTED	50.0	33.3	16.7	33.3	33.3	33.3	63.6	36.4	0.0	41.7	50.0	8.3
RICE	50.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	37.5	37.5	33.3	22.2	44.4	12.5	25.0	62.5
STEELE	40.0	50.0	10.0	20.0	50.0	30.0	40.0	60.0	0.0	60.0	20.0	20.0
WABASHA	63.6	18.2	18.2	45.5	36.4	18.2	45.5	18.2	36.4	50.0	25.0	25.0
WASECA	54.5	36.4	9.1	18.2	54.5	27.3	45.5	36.4	18.2	45.5	36.4	18.2
WATONWAN	41.7	33.3	25.0	16.7	33.3	50.0	16.7	50.0	33.3	41.7	16.7	41.7
WINONA	70.0	20.0	10.0	10.0	30.0	60.0	25.0	37.5	37.5	30.0	50.0	20.0
TOTAL	59.7	25.5	14.8	30.7	38.5	30.7	37.8	33.7	28.5	38.1	30.4	31.4

Table 6A. Expansion through public affairs meetings (domestic agriculture, foreign agriculture, problems of local government, and taxation)

Question: Do you feel Extension agents in your county should sponsor educational programs on public affairs issues?

Percent answering for each response

Central District	Domestic agriculture			Foreign agriculture			Problems of government			Taxation		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
ANOKA	66.7	33.3	0.0	11.1	55.6	33.3	44.4	33.3	22.2	44.4	33.3	22.2
BENTON	58.3	25.0	16.7	25.0	33.3	41.7	33.3	50.0	16.7	18.2	45.5	36.4
CARVER	81.8	18.2	0.0	45.5	27.3	27.3	54.5	27.3	18.2	45.5	36.4	18.2
CHISAGO	72.7	18.2	9.1	20.0	60.0	20.0	40.0	30.0	30.0	50.0	30.0	20.0
DAKOTA	55.6	33.3	11.1	22.2	44.4	33.3	22.2	33.3	44.4	33.3	33.3	33.3
HENNEPIN	50.0	40.0	10.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	40.0	20.0	40.0	33.3	33.3	33.3
ISANTI	75.0	25.0	0.0	50.0	33.3	16.7	83.3	16.7	0.0	58.3	33.3	8.3
KANDIYOHI	66.7	16.7	16.7	25.0	58.3	16.7	58.3	33.3	8.3	58.3	33.3	8.3
MCLEOD	60.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	50.0	30.0	30.0	60.0	10.0	58.3	16.7	25.0
MEEKER	45.5	36.4	18.2	18.2	54.5	27.3	33.3	33.3	33.3	33.3	33.3	33.3
MILLE LACS	55.6	22.2	22.2	22.2	44.4	33.3	55.6	0.0	44.4	55.6	0.0	44.4
RAMSEY	0.0	42.9	57.1	0.0	42.9	57.1	28.6	28.6	42.9	14.3	28.6	57.1
RENVILLE	54.5	18.2	27.3	45.5	36.4	18.2	27.3	18.2	54.5	18.2	27.3	54.5
SCOTT	63.6	27.3	9.1	36.4	36.4	27.3	72.7	27.3	0.0	66.7	0.0	33.3
SHERBURNE	72.7	18.2	9.1	27.3	54.5	18.2	45.5	9.1	45.5	27.3	36.4	36.4
SIBLEY	100.0	0.0	0.0	54.5	27.3	18.2	36.4	45.5	18.2	41.7	33.3	25.0
STEARNS	60.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	50.0	30.0	40.0	30.0	30.0	40.0	40.0	20.0
WASHINGTON	72.7	18.2	9.1	27.3	27.3	45.5	50.0	33.3	16.7	58.3	25.0	16.7
WRIGHT	30.0	30.0	40.0	20.0	10.0	70.0	50.0	25.0	25.0	20.0	40.0	40.0
TOTAL	61.6	23.7	14.6	28.9	41.1	29.9	45.3	29.4	25.4	41.8	29.4	28.9

Table 6A. Expansion through public affairs meetings (domestic agriculture, foreign agriculture, problems of local government, and taxation)

Question: Do you feel Extension agents in your county should sponsor educational programs on public affairs issues?

Percent answering for each response

Northeast District	Domestic agriculture Yes	Neutral	No	Foreign agriculture Yes	Neutral	No	Problems of government Yes	Neutral	No	Taxation Yes	Neutral	No
AITKIN	83.3	16.7	0.0	41.7	33.3	25.0	50.0	25.0	25.0	41.7	33.3	25.0
BELTRAMI	45.5	45.5	9.1	0.0	60.0	40.0	54.5	27.3	18.2	30.0	50.0	20.0
CARLTON	83.3	16.7	0.0	25.0	58.3	16.7	41.7	41.7	16.7	75.0	16.7	8.3
CASS	72.7	18.2	9.1	27.3	45.5	27.3	45.5	18.2	36.4	10.0	10.0	80.0
CLEARWATER	63.6	27.3	9.1	27.3	45.5	27.3	33.3	33.3	33.3	33.3	33.3	33.3
COOK	30.0	30.0	40.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	40.0	20.0	40.0	30.0	30.0	40.0
CROW WING	100.0	0.0	0.0	37.5	37.5	25.0	62.5	12.5	25.0	37.5	37.5	25.0
HUBBARD	75.0	12.5	12.5	25.0	62.5	12.5	37.5	50.0	12.5	25.0	50.0	25.0
ITASCA	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0	37.5	62.5	62.5	25.0	12.5	62.5	12.5	25.0
KANABEC	70.0	20.0	10.0	20.0	40.0	40.0	54.5	27.3	18.2	40.0	20.0	40.0
KOOCHICHIN	55.6	0.0	44.4	44.4	11.1	44.4	33.3	22.2	44.4	55.6	0.0	44.4
LAKE	62.5	12.5	25.0	25.0	37.5	37.5	25.0	37.5	37.5	25.0	50.0	25.0
LAKE WOODS	91.7	8.3	0.0	45.5	36.4	18.2	41.7	25.0	33.3	41.7	25.0	33.3
MORRISON	75.0	16.7	8.3	41.7	50.0	8.3	41.7	41.7	16.7	33.3	25.0	41.7
PINE	90.0	10.0	0.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	27.3	36.4	36.4	30.0	50.0	20.0
ST. LOUIS	90.9	9.1	0.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	50.0	40.0	10.0	50.0	20.0	30.0
District TOTAL	71.1	17.5	11.4	28.1	43.1	28.7	43.6	30.3	26.1	39.1	28.6	32.3
State TOTAL	63.8	23.1	13.1	29.6	41.7	28.6	39.2	33.7	27.1	35.5	32.4	32.1

Table 6B. Expansion through public affairs meetings (mental health, extent and causes of poverty, availability of federal programs, and international relations)

Question: Do you feel Extension agents in your county should sponsor educational programs on public affairs issues?

Percent answering for each response

Northwest District	Mental health			Poverty			Available federal programs			International relations		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BECKER	44.4	55.6	0.0	30.0	40.0	30.0	45.5	45.5	9.1	0.0	40.0	60.0
CLAY	0.0	50.0	50.0	8.3	58.3	33.3	50.0	33.3	16.7	8.3	33.3	58.4
KITTSON	10.0	50.0	40.0	20.0	30.0	50.0	90.0	10.0	0.0	20.0	30.0	50.0
MAHNOMEN	37.5	37.5	25.0	14.3	57.1	28.6	42.9	28.6	28.6	0.0	57.1	42.9
MARSHALL	10.0	50.0	40.0	33.3	33.3	33.3	30.0	50.0	20.0	25.0	25.0	50.0
NORMAN	10.0	40.0	50.0	30.0	50.0	20.0	80.0	20.0	0.0	40.0	40.0	20.0
OTTER TAIL	10.0	40.0	50.0	40.0	30.0	30.0	40.0	30.0	30.0	10.0	50.0	40.0
PENNINGTON	20.0	20.0	60.0	36.4	45.5	18.2	83.3	16.7	0.0	27.3	27.3	45.4
POLK	33.3	0.0	66.7	37.5	25.0	37.5	77.8	0.0	22.2	27.3	27.3	45.4
REDLAKE	10.0	50.0	40.0	10.0	60.0	30.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	10.0	70.0	20.0
ROSEAU	11.1	33.3	55.6	10.0	60.0	30.0	60.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	44.4	55.6
TODD	27.3	36.4	36.4	27.3	36.4	36.4	63.6	27.3	9.1	9.1	54.5	36.4
WADENA	0.0	55.6	44.4	11.1	77.8	11.1	66.7	22.2	11.1	0.0	44.4	55.6
WILKIN	16.7	16.7	66.7	16.7	33.3	50.0	41.7	25.0	33.3	8.3	58.4	33.3
TOTAL	16.5	38.1	45.3	23.0	45.3	31.7	58.7	27.3	14.0	13.6	42.9	43.5

Table 6B. Expansion through public affairs meetings (mental health, extent and causes of poverty, availability of federal programs, and international relations)

Question: Do you feel Extension agents in your county should sponsor educational programs on public affairs issues?

Percent answering for each response

Southwest District	Mental health			Poverty			Available federal programs			International relations		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BIG STONE	25.0	62.5	12.5	37.5	50.0	12.5	87.5	12.5	0.0	0.0	87.5	12.5
CHIPPEWA	18.2	27.3	54.5	9.1	36.4	54.5	45.5	54.5	0.0	0.0	36.4	63.6
COTTONWOOD	20.0	40.0	40.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	70.0	20.0	10.0	30.0	50.0	20.0
DOUGLAS	18.2	36.4	45.5	27.3	45.5	27.3	41.7	33.3	25.0	9.2	45.4	45.4
GRANT	30.0	40.0	30.0	45.5	54.5	0.0	63.6	36.4	0.0	36.4	36.4	27.2
JACKSON	25.0	58.3	16.7	33.3	41.7	25.0	58.3	33.3	8.3	16.6	41.7	41.7
LAC QUI PA	18.2	45.5	36.4	36.4	45.5	18.2	72.7	27.3	0.0	9.1	72.7	18.2
LINCOLN	18.2	27.3	54.5	18.2	9.1	72.7	54.5	45.5	0.0	18.2	27.3	54.5
LYON	11.1	22.2	66.7	0.0	44.4	55.6	11.1	66.7	22.2	0.0	44.4	55.6
MURRAY	9.1	36.4	54.5	18.2	63.6	18.2	45.5	36.4	18.2	0.0	45.5	54.5
NOBLES	30.0	50.0	20.0	30.0	50.0	20.0	70.0	30.0	0.0	10.0	40.0	50.0
PIPESTONE	10.0	70.0	20.0	30.0	70.0	0.0	50.0	40.0	10.0	10.0	40.0	50.0
POPE	18.2	27.3	54.5	27.3	54.5	18.2	54.5	36.4	9.1	27.3	27.3	45.4
REDWOOD	50.0	12.5	37.5	25.0	25.0	50.0	37.5	37.5	25.0	0.0	37.5	62.5
ROCK	25.0	25.0	50.0	25.0	33.3	41.7	50.0	33.3	16.7	16.7	16.7	66.6
STEVENS	0.0	27.3	72.7	18.2	18.2	63.6	36.4	18.2	45.5	0.0	36.4	63.6
SWIFT	20.0	70.0	10.0	50.0	40.0	10.0	60.0	40.0	0.0	33.3	55.6	11.1
TRAVERSE	20.0	30.0	50.0	50.0	20.0	30.0	54.5	18.2	27.3	0.0	50.0	50.0
YELLOW MED	30.0	50.0	20.0	33.3	44.4	22.2	70.0	30.0	0.0	33.3	55.6	11.1
TOTAL	20.4	39.8	39.8	29.1	41.3	29.6	54.3	34.2	11.6	12.4	44.6	43.0

Table 6B. Expansion through public affairs meetings (mental health, extent and causes of poverty, availability of federal programs, and international relations)

Question: Do you feel Extension agents in your county should sponsor educational programs on public affairs issues?

Percent answering for each response

Southeast District	Mental health			Poverty			Available federal programs			International relations		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BLUE EARTH	10.0	30.0	60.0	18.2	36.4	45.5	50.0	30.0	20.0	0.0	33.3	66.7
BROWN	27.3	72.7	0.0	45.5	36.4	18.2	36.4	36.4	27.3	0.0	72.7	27.3
DODGE	16.7	16.7	66.7	8.3	41.7	50.0	66.7	25.0	8.3	10.0	30.0	60.0
FARIBAULT	0.0	16.7	83.3	16.7	41.7	41.7	50.0	25.0	25.0	8.3	25.0	66.7
FILLMORE	11.1	44.4	44.4	22.2	44.4	33.3	44.4	44.4	11.1	0.0	33.3	66.7
FREEBORN	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	62.5	37.5	62.5	37.5	0.0	0.0	62.5	37.5
GOODHUE	16.7	50.0	33.3	41.7	33.3	25.0	50.0	25.0	25.0	16.7	25.0	58.3
HOUSTON	9.1	54.5	36.4	27.3	36.4	36.4	50.0	50.0	0.0	9.1	63.6	27.3
LE SUEUR	8.3	25.0	66.7	0.0	58.3	41.7	41.7	41.7	16.7	9.1	90.9	0.0
MARTIN	37.5	25.0	37.5	0.0	57.1	42.9	77.8	11.1	11.1	9.1	33.3	45.6
MOWER	11.1	33.3	55.6	22.2	22.2	55.6	30.0	40.0	30.0	11.2	44.4	44.4
NICOLLET	33.3	16.7	50.0	16.7	33.3	50.0	66.7	16.7	16.7	25.0	25.0	50.0
OLMSTED	8.3	33.3	58.3	0.0	58.3	41.7	36.4	63.6	0.0	16.7	33.3	50.0
RICE	0.0	12.5	87.5	25.0	12.5	62.5	44.4	33.3	22.2	0.0	25.0	75.0
STEELE	30.0	40.0	30.0	44.4	22.2	33.3	50.0	50.0	0.0	10.0	50.0	40.0
WABASHA	18.2	63.6	18.2	9.1	63.6	27.3	72.7	18.2	9.1	9.1	54.5	36.4
WASECA	27.3	45.5	27.3	18.2	54.5	27.3	45.5	36.4	18.2	0.0	63.6	36.4
WATONWAN	25.0	41.7	33.3	16.7	50.0	33.3	41.7	25.0	33.3	8.3	41.7	50.0
WINONA	11.1	33.3	55.6	25.0	12.5	62.5	37.5	50.0	12.5	0.0	33.3	66.7
TOTAL	15.5	37.8	46.6	18.8	41.9	39.3	49.7	34.7	15.5	8.2	40.5	51.3

Table 6B. Expansion through public affairs meetings (mental health, extent and causes of poverty, availability of federal programs, and international relations)

Question: Do you feel Extension agents in your county should sponsor educational programs on public affairs issues?

Percent answering for each response

Central District	Mental health			Poverty			Available federal programs			International relations		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
ANOKA	22.2	55.6	22.2	22.2	66.7	11.1	77.8	0.0	22.2	0.0	44.4	55.6
BENTON	27.3	36.4	36.4	25.0	66.7	8.3	58.3	41.7	0.0	9.2	45.4	45.4
CARVER	27.3	27.3	45.5	9.1	45.5	45.5	18.2	27.3	54.5	9.1	36.4	54.5
CHISAGO	10.0	50.0	40.0	30.0	30.0	40.0	36.4	27.3	36.4	0.0	50.0	50.0
DAKOTA	12.5	50.0	37.5	33.3	22.2	44.4	66.7	11.1	22.2	22.2	33.3	44.5
HENNEPIN	30.0	40.0	30.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	50.0	40.0	10.0	22.2	44.5	33.3
ISANTI	25.0	58.3	16.7	45.5	45.5	9.1	58.3	41.7	0.0	8.3	66.7	25.0
KANDIYOHI	8.3	50.0	41.7	58.3	25.0	16.7	54.5	36.4	9.1	16.7	50.0	33.3
MCLEOD	27.3	27.3	45.5	45.5	9.1	45.5	45.5	27.3	27.3	9.0	45.5	45.5
MEEKER	25.0	33.3	41.7	58.3	16.7	25.0	60.0	30.0	10.0	9.1	36.4	54.5
MILLE LACS	11.1	33.3	55.6	44.4	33.3	22.2	66.7	22.2	11.1	18.2	45.6	18.2
RAMSEY	57.1	28.6	14.3	57.1	28.6	14.3	57.1	28.6	14.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
RENVILLE	18.2	45.5	36.4	36.4	45.5	18.2	36.4	63.6	0.0	18.2	36.4	45.4
SCOTT	45.5	27.3	27.3	36.4	18.2	45.5	63.6	18.2	18.2	18.2	36.4	45.4
SHERBURNE	18.2	36.4	45.5	20.0	60.0	20.0	75.0	8.3	16.7	9.1	63.6	27.3
SIBLEY	16.7	50.0	33.3	18.2	36.4	45.5	75.0	16.7	8.3	18.2	45.4	36.4
STEARNS	20.0	50.0	30.0	0.0	60.0	40.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	0.0	70.0	30.0
WASHINGTON	25.0	25.0	50.0	0.0	54.5	45.5	27.3	63.6	9.1	0.0	27.3	72.7
WRIGHT	36.4	18.2	45.5	30.0	10.0	60.0	11.1	33.3	55.6	0.0	40.0	60.0
TOTAL	24.0	39.0	37.0	32.0	37.6	30.5	51.5	30.8	17.7	10.4	44.8	44.8

Table 6B. Expansion through public affairs meetings (mental health, extent and causes of poverty, availability of federal programs, and international relations)

Question: Do you feel Extension agents in your county should sponsor educational programs on public affairs issues?

Percent answering for each response

Northeast District	Mental health			Poverty			Available federal programs			International relations		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
AITKIN	27.3	45.5	27.3	9.1	72.7	18.2	81.8	0.0	18.2	27.3	45.4	27.3
BELTRAMI	11.1	55.6	33.3	20.0	40.0	40.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
CARLTON	41.7	33.3	25.0	41.7	33.3	25.0	66.7	25.0	8.3	0.0	58.3	41.7
CASS	20.0	0.0	80.0	10.0	50.0	40.0	54.5	36.4	9.1	18.2	18.2	63.6
CLEARWATER	18.2	45.5	36.4	25.0	41.7	33.3	45.5	36.4	18.2	0.0	54.5	45.5
COOK	40.0	40.0	20.0	50.0	30.0	20.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	50.0	40.0
CROW WING	0.0	62.5	37.5	75.0	0.0	25.0	60.0	10.0	30.0	25.0	37.5	37.5
HUBBARD	12.5	62.5	25.0	12.5	87.5	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	12.5	50.0	37.5
ITASCA	37.5	12.5	50.0	25.0	62.5	12.5	37.5	37.5	25.0	0.0	62.5	37.5
KANABEC	30.0	20.0	50.0	40.0	20.0	40.0	60.0	40.0	0.0	8.3	41.7	50.0
KOOCHICHIN	11.1	44.4	44.4	22.2	33.3	44.4	22.2	44.4	33.3	11.1	33.3	45.6
LAKE	12.5	62.5	25.0	12.5	75.0	12.5	50.0	37.5	12.5	0.0	62.5	37.5
LAKE WOODS	9.1	72.7	18.2	27.3	54.5	18.2	83.3	16.7	0.0	9.1	90.9	0.0
MORRISON	16.7	50.0	33.3	41.7	25.0	33.3	45.5	36.4	18.2	25.0	58.3	16.7
PINE	30.0	40.0	30.0	50.0	30.0	20.0	90.9	0.0	9.1	10.0	30.0	60.0
ST. LOUIS	41.7	33.3	25.0	25.0	58.3	16.7	81.8	9.1	9.1	18.2	54.5	27.3
District TOTAL	23.3	42.1	34.6	30.4	44.1	25.5	63.8	24.5	11.7	11.1	50.0	38.9
State TOTAL	20.1	39.3	40.6	26.8	41.7	31.4	55.1	30.7	14.2	0.0	0.0	0.0

ERIC Clearinghouse
AUG 10 1970
on Adult Education